

After Reading Hand to a Friend.

DOCUMENT NO. 1

THE DEFENDER

Devoted to the Protection of American Labor and Industries.

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE,
No. 339 Broadway, New York

DOC. NO. 1

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1916

4 CENTS EACH

ABRAHAM LINCOLN PROTECTIONIST

Washington Introduced the American System of Protection to
Domestic Labor and Industry, and Lincoln Aided in
Establishing and Perfecting That System.

AT THE REQUEST OF THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE HON. GEORGE B. CURTISS, OF BINGHAMTON, N. Y., AUTHOR OF "THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONS"—ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT WORKS ON PROTECTION THAT HAS EVER BEEN WRITTEN—AND ALSO AN HONORARY MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE, HAS PREPARED AN ARTICLE ENTITLED "ABRAHAM LINCOLN A PROTECTIONIST." THIS ARTICLE APPEARED IN SECTIONS FROM WEEK TO WEEK IN THE AMERICAN ECONOMIST, AND IS NOW PRINTED IN DOCUMENT FORM. MR. CURTISS HAS BESTOWED UPON THIS SUBJECT MUCH THOUGHT, MUCH CARE AND EXTENDED RESEARCH. THE VALUE OF HIS LABORS IN THIS CONNECTION CAN HARDLY BE OVERESTIMATED.

Abraham Lincoln One of the Great Protectionists of the World.

Lincoln's public career as a writer, speaker and Chief Executive, places him in the foreground of the great constructive statesmen and Protectionists of the world. Washington introduced the system of Protection, and Lincoln perfected it; Washington signed the first Protective Tariff law, and Lincoln signed the highest Protective Tariff law ever passed by Congress. The Protective policy introduced by Washington was supported by Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson. It stood for forty-five years, until overthrown by the friends of slavery and the enemies of the Union, but was restored and perfected by Lincoln and continued by Grant, Hayes, Harrison

and McKinley. It was overthrown for three years by Cleveland, with great disaster to the country. It is now being assailed by Woodrow Wilson, but the spirit of Washington and Lincoln still lives and the end is not yet.

Declarations of Abraham Lincoln. He Favored a "High Protective Tariff."

"I am in favor of a National Bank; I am in favor of the internal improvement system and a high Protective Tariff. These are my sentiments and political principles." (From Abraham Lincoln's first political speech, 1832.)

How He Would Restrict Foreign Trade.

"If I be asked whether I would destroy all commerce I answer, certainly not; I would continue it where it is necessary and discontinue it where it is

not. An instance: I would continue commerce so far as it is employed in bringing us coffee, and I would discontinue it so far as it is employed in bringing us cotton goods." (From "Fragments of Tariff Discussion," 1847.)

The Abandonment of Protection Would Produce Want and Ruin.

"The abandonment of the Protective policy by the American Government must result in the increase of both useless labor and idleness, and so, in proportion, must produce want and ruin among our people." (From "Fragments of Tariff Discussion," 1847.)

The Famous Epigram.

"Abraham Lincoln's first speech on the Tariff question was short and to the point. He said that he did not pretend to be learned in political economy, but that he thought he knew enough to know that 'When an American paid twenty dollars for steel to an English manufacturer, America had the steel and England had the twenty dollars. But when he paid twenty dollars for steel to an American manufacturer, America had both the steel and the twenty dollars.' That was the sum and substance of the Tariff question as he viewed it." (Editorial in the Harvard Independent of Harvard, Ill., of June 9, 1894, written by Otis S. Eastman.)

Had Not Changed His Views in 1859.

"I was an old Henry Clay Tariff Whig. In old times I made more speeches on that subject than any other. I have not since changed my views." (Letter from Abraham Lincoln to Dr. Edward Wallace, October 11, 1859.)

He Stood for the Republican Platform of 1860.

"In the Chicago platform there is a plank upon this subject which should be a general law to the incoming administration. We should do neither more nor less than we gave the people reason to believe we would when they gave us their votes." (Speech of Abraham Lincoln, delivered at Pittsburg, Pa., February 16, 1861.)

"That while providing revenue for the support of the general government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as to encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchanges which secures to workmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerative prices, to mechanics and manufacturers adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence." (Chicago Platform, 1860, Section 12.)

Introductory.

The attitude of Abraham Lincoln on the Tariff question has been left in par-

tial obscurity, while his opinions on every other great question upon which he expressed himself have, during the past twenty years, been given more prominence, and his life and character subjected to greater research and consideration than those of any other statesman of modern times. As the emancipator of an enslaved race, and the Chief Executive who saved the life of the American Republic, Abraham Lincoln stands out as one of the great historic characters of the world. The exalted position which he attained as the emancipator of a race and savior of a country arrested the attention of the world and turned historians and scholars to a critical investigation of the causes of his success and the sources of his power and influence. As the result of a most searching inquiry, he is accepted today as America's greatest President; as one of the wisest and most profound statesmen of the world. Events have proven that he was sound on every great public question which he investigated and upon which he expressed opinions.

Abraham Lincoln, during his whole public career, was a member of political parties which favored as one of their chief political doctrines the policy of "Protection to home industries." He joined the Whig party when it was formed, and remained a staunch supporter of its principles until the Northern wing of that party united with the Jackson or Free Soil Democrats and formed the Republican party in 1854.

First Speech on the Tariff.

An account of Lincoln's first political speech is given by William H. Herndon (who had been his law partner) in his "Life of Abraham Lincoln," published by D. Appleton & Co., pages 94 and 95.

Late in the political campaign of 1832 Lincoln returned from the Black Hawk War, in which he had served as captain of a company, and announced himself as a candidate for the legislature. Mr. Herndon says:

"His maiden effort on the stump was a speech on the occasion of a public sale at Pappsville, a village eleven miles west of Springfield. Lincoln said:

"Fellow Citizens: I presume you all know who I am. I am the humble Abraham Lincoln. I have been solicited by many friends to become a candidate for the legislature. My politics are short and sweet, like the old woman's dance. I am in favor of a National Bank; I am in favor of the internal improvement system and a high Protective Tariff. These are my sentiments and political principles. If elected I shall be thankful; if not it will be all the same."

Lincoln was noted for saying a great deal in a very few words. This faculty, which he possessed in such a high degree, was never better employed than when in this first speech he said: "I am

in favor of (1) a National Bank; (2) the internal improvement system, and (3) a high Protective Tariff." These were the three great questions at that time in controversy between the people of the slave-holding and free States and around which centered the great debates in the halls of Congress. In a letter written to Dr. Wallace in 1859, he said:

"I was an old Henry Clay Tariff Whig. In old times I made more speeches on that subject than any other. I have not since changed my views."

What Is a High Protective Tariff?

It is significant and shows his power of discrimination and the precision with which he spoke when he used the word "high" in defining the kind of a Tariff which he favored, for at this time the enemies of American industries were demanding a low Tariff, or one imposed for "revenue only," while the friends of American industries favored rates of duties high enough to protect our manufacturers, producers and laborers from the ruinous competition in our home market of the products of the poorly-paid labor of the Old World. To the importer any rate of duty which restricted the sale of foreign-made goods in the American market was too high. It was to him a high Tariff. This was equally true to the slaveholder and those who favored a Tariff for revenue only, or Free-Trade.

The low Tariff advocates favored Free-Trade, or the unrestricted purchase of foreign-made goods, instead of patronizing home industries. Lincoln was not only in favor of a "high" Tariff, but a high Protective Tariff; that is, a Tariff of duties high enough to secure to American manufacturers, producers, agriculturalists and laborers the entire home market, in order that our industries might thrive, labor be fully employed, the native resources and water powers be utilized, and the independence and prosperity of the people be made secure.

A Henry Clay Tariff Whig.

His statement in his letter to Dr. Wallace, in 1859, that he was "an old Henry Clay Tariff Whig" contains a volume of meaning. It covers the whole ground, for Henry Clay was the greatest advocate of sound Protectionist doctrines since Alexander Hamilton. He was the leader of that body of statesmen who gave effect to the great principles expounded by Hamilton in the high Protective Tariff laws of 1824, 1828 and 1832. It was Henry Clay who in one of his great speeches gave to the Protective Tariff policy as advocated by Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson, our first eight Presidents, the name "American System." So when Lincoln said he was "an old Henry Clay Tariff Whig" it meant that he favored that

form of Protection taught by Hamilton, Matthew Carey, Henry Clay and the great expounders of sound Protectionism.

Henry Clay's Tariff Principles.

The practical operation of the Protective system as laid down by Hamilton and expounded and defended by Henry Clay in his great speeches, and what would result from it, were defined as follows:

First. That Protection was necessary in order to establish a system of manufacturing.

Second. That by establishing a system of manufacturing, these results would follow:

I. Diversification of industries.

II. Division of labor.

III. The producer and consumer would be brought together, saving to the consumer expense of transportation, commission, etc.

IV. It would encourage home trade.

V. It would build up a home market.

VI. Encourage the immigration of skilled artisans, manufacturers and agriculturists.

VII. Invite the investment of foreign and domestic capital in the establishment of domestic industries.

VIII. Give employment to labor at higher wages than are paid in the Old World.

IX. Stimulate the inventive genius of the people.

X. Stimulate the industry of the people.

XI. Insure to industry the rewards of its labor.

XII. It would develop the resources of the country.

XIII. It would secure to the agriculturist at home the most reliable and largest possible market for the greatest variety of the produce of the farm and garden.

Third. That it shields the consumers of the country from foreign monopoly, and the competition between native and foreign manufacturers tends to reduce the price of commodities to the level of fair profits based on the cost of production, under conditions existing at home.

Fourth. That it increases foreign trade by stimulating the production of a greater variety of domestic articles for export, and so adds to the wealth, spendable income and purchasing power of the people that the importation of non-competing articles and luxuries will be greatly augmented.

Fifth. That it tends to secure a favorable balance of trade and prevents a drain of the precious metals.

Sixth. That it makes the nation independent of other nations in time of war.

Seventh. That it makes possible the accumulation of capital which is necessary to the establishment of sound banks, and the growth of agriculture,

manufacturing, mining, shipping, means of transportation, and everything upon which the material well-being of the people depends.

What Lincoln Meant.

It is by becoming familiar with the foregoing history and the principles of the Protective system that we are able to understand what Lincoln meant when he said, in 1832:

"I am in favor of * * * a high Protective Tariff." And what he meant, in 1859, when he said:

"I was an old Henry Clay Tariff Whig. I have not since changed my views."

It was during the great debates on the Tariff question between 1819 and the close of the session of 1832 that Henry Clay distinguished himself above all other statesmen of that time as an advocate of Protection. It was Henry Clay that perfected and reduced to practical form the principles of Protection enunciated by Alexander Hamilton in his great Report on Manufactures. It was Henry Clay who gave to Protection the name "American System," and who, in his great speech on March 30 and 31, 1824, said:

"The best security against the demoralization of society is the constant and profitable employment of its members. The greatest danger to public liberty is from idleness and vice."

In the same speech he also said:

"The greatest want of civilized society is a market for the exchange and sale of its surplus produce. This market may exist at home or abroad, but it must exist somewhere if society prospers. The home market is the first in order and paramount in importance. The object of the bill under consideration is to create this market and to lay the foundation of a genuine American policy."

Henry Clay's Plan of Imposing Duties.

Prior to 1832 no distinction was made between non-competing commodities, luxuries and competing manufactures. All were subjected to the payment of import duties; some, distinctly for the purpose of raising revenue; others, both for revenue and Protection. In 1832 we had reached a point where the national debt was extinguished, and a large surplus of revenue was in the treasury. This condition made a revision of the Tariff necessary. It was at this time that the Tariff question for the first time in our history became a party question. It was at this time that the South declared in favor of Free-Trade. It was at this time that the slavery controversy plunged the country into sectional politics and endangered the life of the nation.

The chief leaders of the Free-Trade party were George MacDuffie of South Carolina in the House, and Robert Y. Hayne, of the same State, in the Senate; and of the Protectionist forces, John Quincy Adams in the House, and Henry

Clay in the Senate. Henry Clay presented a resolution setting forth the system of levying duties in accordance with the Protective system, which provided that (1) non-competing commodities of foreign production, the like of which cannot be produced in the United States, such as tea, coffee, etc., should be admitted into the United States free of duty; (2) that certain articles of luxury, although produced abroad, such as diamonds, fine jewelry, wines, liquors, should be subject to the payment of duties for revenue purposes; (3) that duties for the purpose of securing their production at home be imposed on all competing articles, or those articles the like of which might be produced in the United States. Under this system revenues were to be reduced by repealing the duties on non-competing articles. The system of Protection was to be preserved in all its integrity. This plan was embodied in the Protective law of 1832. It met the violent opposition of the planters and importers. The former saw at once that it meant the continuation of a public policy which would make the free States prosperous, rich and powerful, and the latter that the importation into the United States of competing manufactures would be diminished as domestic industries were established and extended, and in this respect that branch of foreign commerce would be injured and they would lose profits.

The Free-Trade Plan of Imposing Duties.

The Free-Trade plan of levying duties in the revision of the tariff was set forth in a counter-proposition presented by George MacDuffie, which provided for the levying of duties on substantially all articles, competing as well as non-competing, at a uniform rate of 12½ per cent. ad valorem. The duties were intended to be so low that the manufactures already established in the free States would be destroyed and the country would enter upon a policy of free international trade, the idea being that our cotton, tobacco and all raw materials would be sent to England, and as it was called, exchanged there for manufactures; it being contended that the American people should be permitted to buy their manufactures where they could buy the cheapest, and it being conceded that wages were low in the Old World, and that England had erected an enormous manufacturing system by industrial organization, the use of machinery and skilled artisans, and having the ships to transport them to market, could under Democratic revenue duties flood the American market with their wares, force into bankruptcy every industry which had been established, and through the power of competition forever prevent the establishment of a system of manufactures on American soil.

Origin and Meaning of the word "Only."

The South also took the position that Congress had no power under the Constitution to levy duties for the purpose of fostering and encouraging the establishment of our industries. The importing and shipping interests of the Northern States and many persons in other occupations composing the Northern wing of the Democratic party, while being in favor of Free-Trade, did not fully concur with the representatives of the planting States on the Constitutional question. This subject was brought before the Free-Trade convention held in Philadelphia in 1831, which by resolution declared that "they admit the power of Congress to levy and collect such duties as they may deem necessary for the purpose of revenue, and within those limits to arrange those duties so as to 'incidentally and to that extent give Protection to the manufacturers.'" "

This principle Judge Job Johnson, of South Carolina, representing the Southern delegation, declared "was to give away the whole case, fatal to the cause of Free-Trade and fatal to the constitutional argument."

The proposition that the Constitution would permit revenue duties which "incidentally" or, as an incident thereto, might afford a small degree of Protection, was rejected by the new Democratic party, and to express such dissent, the term "Tariff for revenue only" was adopted. Thus by the use of the word "only" every vestige of Protection was excluded. This was the origin of the expression "A Tariff for revenue only."

Difference Between Protective Duties and Duties for Revenue.

Mr. Calhoun, in a speech before the Senate in 1842, gave a clear and definite interpretation of "a Tariff for revenue only" policy. He said:

"No two things, Senator, are more different than the duties for revenue and Protection. They are as opposite as light and darkness. The one is friendly and the other hostile to the importation of the articles on which they may be imposed. Revenue seeks not to exclude or diminish the amount imported. On the contrary, if it should be the result, it neither designed nor desired it. While it takes, it patronizes; and patronizes that it may take more. It is the reverse in every respect with Protection—it seeks, directly, exclusion or diminution. It is the desired result, and if it fails in it then it fails in its object."

A Tariff for revenue only, then, seeks to accomplish two essential purposes: First, to raise revenue on duties from imports for the support of the Government; second, to fix the duties at such a low rate that Protection is made impossible.

The South was supported in its op-

position to the Protective system by the importers of our great seaboard cities, many of whom were agents of foreign manufacturers, and all attempting to prevent the establishment of domestic manufactures in order that they might make profits by selling to the American people foreign made goods. The shipping interests of New England and the East, although favored until about 1828 with Protection to their business, also opposed the building up of our native industries upon the theory that by so much as our domestic raw materials were produced, and manufactures were made in our domestic mills for the supply of our home market, the imports of similar commodities brought from abroad would be diminished and domestic materials would be worked up at home instead of being exported, and they would suffer a great loss in the ocean carrying trade. It was from the belief that as home trade in domestic commodities increased, foreign commerce in competing articles would be diminished, that the importers and the ship owner cried out, "Protection injures our foreign commerce." Many persons engaged in trade, professions and occupations not directly affected by the Tariff were also led to believe that under a system of Free-Trade it would be to their advantage to buy manufactured articles made abroad, and the farmer of the non-manufacturing sections of the Western States was advised that he could save money by buying from the foreign manufacturers rather than from the American. So a formidable party in favor of Free-Trade, composed of the elements mentioned in the North, uniting with the slaveholding interests, was organized by the Democratic party which waged an incessant and aggressive political warfare against the establishment and extension of American industries.

Nullification and Secession.

South Carolina led the way in 1832 by passing an ordinance declaring null and void the Protective Tariff law of 1832, and threatened to secede from the Union in case President Jackson attempted to enforce the collection of duties at the port of Charleston. This was the first overt act threatening the life of the nation by the slaveholding interests. Before General Jackson had entered upon the first year of his second term, as President, he was confronted with a most alarming condition of affairs. Civil war and the dissolution of the Union was threatened. The Tariff of 1832 was made the pretext for this threatened revolt. The people of the free States were compelled to choose between two alternatives, a coercion of the State of South Carolina by military force, or the abandonment of the Protective system.

The Compromise of 1833.

So many congressmen throughout the

North were in favor of yielding this point to the South, temporarily at least, that the Compromise act of 1833 was enacted, under which the duties of the existing law were to be reduced, was passed, providing for a reduction of duties on a sliding scale; 10 per cent. of the excess of duties above 20 per cent. was to be taken off every two years, until finally in 1842 a system of uniform ad valorem duties of 20 per cent. was to be established.

The New Democratic Party.

The new Democratic party was organized, and nominated Martin VanBuren for President, and presented its first declaration of party principles in resolutions adopted by its National Convention in 1836. It declared that Congress had no power under the Constitution to grant a charter for a National Bank, to appropriate money for the improvement of highways and other public improvements, or to impose duties on imports to foster and protect home industries. This was its business creed. It also favored the Protection and extension of slavery, State sovereignty, and the right of secession. From this time until 1861 it controlled the United States Senate, and failed in the election of a President only twice, 1840 and 1848. To make the control of the slave States supreme over the party, it in 1836 adopted the two-thirds rule in its Presidential nominations. Its party control then became a mere matter of political bargain and sale. Martin VanBuren's famous maxim, "Carry the South by going with the South, and the North by party machinery," became the keynote of Democracy.

When Cotton Was King.

The most authoritative account of the causes which induced the people of the slave States to oppose the policy of Protection and favor the doctrine of Free-Trade is found in a work entitled "Cotton Is King" and "Pro-slavery Arguments," edited by E. N. Elliott, LL.D., President of the Planter's College of Mississippi, published in Atlanta, Ga., by Pritchard, Abbott & Loomis, in 1860. The part from which the following quotations are taken was written by David Christie, Esq., and published under the title of "Cotton Is King, or Slavery in the Light of Political Economy." From the following extracts we have the entire scheme unfolded:

"The logical conclusion, from these different results, was that the less provisions and the more cotton grown by the planter, the greater would be his profits. This must be noted with special care. Markets for the surplus products of the farmer of the North were equally as important to him as the supply of provisions was to the planter. But the planter, to be eminently successful, must purchase his supplies at the lowest pos-

sible prices; while the farmer, to secure his prosperity, must sell his products at the highest possible rates. Few, indeed, can be so ill-informed as not to know that these two topics for many years were involved in the "Free-Trade" and "Protective Tariff" doctrines, and afforded the material of the political contests between the North and the South—between free labor and slave labor. A very brief notice of the history of that controversy will demonstrate the truth of this assertion.

"A manufacturing population, with its mechanical coadjutors in the midst of the provision-growers, on a scale such as the Protective policy contemplated, it was conceived, would create a permanent market for their products, and enhance the price; whereas, if this manufacturing could be prevented, and a system of Free-Trade adopted, the South would constitute the principal provision market of the country, and the fertile lands of the North supply the cheap food demanded for its slaves. . . . For success in the foreign markets they relied, mainly, upon preparing themselves to produce cotton at the reduced prices then prevailing in Europe. All agricultural products, except cotton, being excluded from foreign markets, the planters found themselves almost the sole exporters of the country; and it was to them a source of chagrin that the North did not, at once, co-operate with them in augmenting the commerce of the nation.

"At this point in the history of the controversy politicians found it an easy matter to produce feeling of the deepest hostility between the opposing parties. The planters were led to believe that the millions of revenue collected off the goods imported was so much deducted from the value of the cotton that paid for them, either in the diminished price they received abroad, or in the increased price which they paid for the imported articles. To enhance the duties, for the Protection of our manufacturers, they were persuaded would be so much of an additional tax upon themselves, for the benefit of the North; and, besides, to give the manufacturer such a monopoly of the home market for his fabrics would enable him to charge purchasers an excess over the true value of his stuffs, to the whole amount of the duty. By the Protective policy, the planters expected to have the cost of both provisions and clothing increased, and their ability to monopolize the foreign markets diminished in a corresponding degree. If they could establish Free-Trade, it would insure the American market to foreign manufacturers; secure the foreign markets for their leading staple; repress home manufactures; force a large number of the Northern men into agriculture; multiply the growth and diminish the price of provisions; feed and clothe their slaves at lower rates; produce their

cotton for a third or fourth of former prices; rival all other countries in its cultivation; monopolize the trade in the article throughout the whole of Europe, and build up a commerce and navy that would make us ruler of the seas.

"Out of this conviction grew the war upon corporations; the hostility to the employment of foreign capital in developing the mineral, agricultural and manufacturing resources of the country; the efforts to destroy the banks and the credit system; the attempts to reduce the currency to gold and silver; the system of collecting the public revenues in coin; the withdrawal of the public moneys from all the banks as a basis of paper circulation; and the sleepless vigilance of the South in resisting all systems of internal improvements by the general government. Its statesmen foresaw that a paper currency would keep up the price of Northern products one or two hundred per cent. above the specie standard; that combinations of capitalists, whether engaged in manufacturing wool, cotton, or iron, would draw off labor from the cultivation of the soil, and cause large bodies of the producers to become consumers; and that roads and canals, connecting the West with the East, were effectual means of bringing the agricultural and manufacturing classes into closer proximity, to the serious limitation of the foreign commerce of the country, the checking of the growth of the navy, and the manifest injury of planters.

Besides this, the abolition movement at that moment, 1832, had assumed its most threatening aspect, and was demanding the destruction of slavery or the dissolution of the Union. Here was a double motive operating to produce harmony in the ranks of Southern politicians, and to awaken the fears of many, North and South, for the safety of the government. Here, also, was the origin of the determination, in the South, to extend slavery by the annexation of territory, so as to gain the political preponderance in the national councils, and to protect its interests against the interference of the North."

They Agreed as to Effects and Results.

An analysis of the debates on the subject shows that there was perfect agreement between the Protectionists of the North and the Free-Traders of the South on the question of the necessary influence of the policy of Protection in building up the industries of the nation. It was conceded by the Free-Traders that through Protection manufactures would be established; skilled manufacturers and artisans would come from the Old World and establish themselves in America; that immigration would be stimulated to people the free States; that capital would flow in from abroad and new capital would be created at home; that villages, cities and great industrial

centers would spring up everywhere; that industries would follow the settlers into the new States; that the whole North would become a scene of thrift, industry and prosperity.

The opposition to Protection by the planters was based on the belief that the free States under its influence would soon become so populous, so strong and powerful that they would outvote the slave States in the halls of Congress, and the political equilibrium between the two sections of the country would be destroyed. It was to prevent the happening of such events that the planters attempted to keep the North poor and backward by preventing the establishment of a system of manufactures. So when we come to consider the objections which they interposed against the American system, instead of finding any reason for the support of Free-Trade or a low Tariff policy based on national welfare, the very reverse appears, and their contentions vindicate the wisdom and justice of the Protective system.

Lincoln's Political Principles.

Lincoln was opposed to each one of the Democratic doctrines. He favored a National Bank; the system of internal improvements; a Protective Tariff; the sovereignty of the people under the perpetual union of the States, and the powers of Congress under the Constitution as expounded by Daniel Webster. He could not favor a National Bank, nor the system of internal improvements, nor the non-extension and abolition of slavery, without being a Protectionist.

Failure of Free-Trade. The Panic 1837 to 1842.

The Compromise act was adopted when the industries of the North were in a flourishing condition and the people were enjoying a high state of prosperity. A repetition of their experience under the low Tariff of 1816 came upon them as Protection gradually disappeared under the sliding scale of reductions. First, the country was visited with a severe financial panic, followed by a period of business and industrial depression, continuing from about 1838 to the restoration of Protection under the Tariff act of 1842. The four years between 1833 and 1842 were perhaps more disastrous than the four years immediately preceding the enactment of the act of 1824. The country was flooded with foreign made goods; factories were closed; many went into bankruptcy; labor was idle; no sale for commodities of any kind at remunerative prices; the balance of trade turned against us; revenues were insufficient; the public treasury was bankrupt and the credit of the nation ruined.

These conditions brought about a revolt against VanBuren's administration and the election of Harrison and Tyler in 1840. Harrison, a Northern man, standing for Whig principles, died

shortly after he was inaugurated, and Tyler, a Virginian, believing in the political doctrines of the slaveholders, became President, and after interposing his veto against several Tariff bills, he was finally compelled, on account of the state of the Treasury, to sign the highly Protective act of 1842.

Protection Overthrown. The Act of 1846.

Notwithstanding the fact that industries revived and prosperity came back as by magic, the warfare against the Protective system was still continued by the Democratic party. In 1843 they were struggling to repeal the act of 1842; in 1844 Henry Clay was beaten on the Tariff issue, and James K. Polk, a Free-Trader, was elected President, and upon his inauguration the Walker Tariff law of 1846, completely overthrowing the Protective system, was enacted. At this time the South accomplished the annexation of Texas; declared war on Mexico, and added the territories of California, New Mexico, and Arizona to our public domain. Growing out of the annexation of Texas and the acquisition of these new territories, the controversy over slavery was renewed, divided and disrupted old political parties and grew in intensity and violence until the secession of the Southern States in 1861, the South struggling to perpetuate and extend slavery in all of its territories, and those in favor of freedom struggling to prevent its further extension, and finally to bring about its total extinction.

The Tariff an Issue from 1840 to 1846.

Abraham Lincoln entered public life at a time when the Tariff question attracted perhaps more attention and was more widely and thoroughly discussed in Congress and out, than during any similar period of our history. The debates in Congress on the subject, from 1824 to 1832, were participated in by the greatest statesmen of the times, and during no period of our congressional history is there to be found in its records debates on the subject conducted with greater talent, learning and ability than during these years. While there was a lull in the controversy following the Compromise act of 1833, the disastrous consequences which resulted from it revived a discussion of the question, and from 1833 to the enactment of the Walker Tariff act of 1846, it was discussed by the people in every neighborhood, community, town, county and state of the Union. It was during this time and under these conditions that Abraham Lincoln announced himself in favor of a high Protective Tariff, and said that he was a Henry Clay Tariff Whig, and made more speeches on the Tariff question than any other.

Very little was written by Lincoln on the Tariff. Although he made many speeches on the subject, yet they do not appear to have been published. His

first speech announcing his position, heretofore quoted, is given by his law partner, Mr. Herndon. His next published statement is found in a circular issued by a Committee of the Whig Party for the State of Illinois, dated March 4, 1843, addressed to the people of that State. It is signed by Abraham Lincoln, S. T. Logan and A. T. Bledsoe, and was written by Lincoln, published in "Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln," edited by John G. Nicolay and John Hay, (edition de Luxe), published by Francis D. Tandy Co., New York, Vol. 1, pages 243-247, as follows:

Protective Circular Written by Lincoln.

"Circular from Whig Committee, March 4, 1843. Address to the People of Illinois.

"Fellow-Citizens: By a resolution of a meeting of such of the Whigs of the State as are now at Springfield, we, the undersigned, were appointed to prepare an address to you. The performance of that task we now undertake.

"Several resolutions were adopted by the meeting; and the chief object of this address is to show briefly the reasons for their adoption.

"The first of those resolutions declares a Tariff of duties upon foreign importations, producing sufficient revenue for the support of the General Government, and so adjusted as to Protect American industry, to be indispensably necessary to the prosperity of the American people and the second declares direct taxation for a national revenue to be improper. Those two resolutions are kindred in their nature, and therefore proper and convenient to be considered together. The question of Protection is a subject entirely too broad to be crowded into a few pages only, together with several other subjects. On that point we therefore content ourselves with giving the following extracts from the writings of Mr. Jefferson, General Jackson, and the speech of Mr. Calhoun:

"To be independent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate them ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. The grand inquiry now is, Shall we make our own comforts, or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to dependence on that foreign nation, or to be clothed in skins and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am not one of those; experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort."—Letter of Mr. Jefferson to Benjamin Austin. [1817].

"I ask, What is the real situation of the agriculturist? Where has the American farmer a market for his surplus produce? Except for cotton, he has neither a foreign nor a home market. Does not this clearly prove, when there is no market at home or abroad, that

there [is] too much labor employed in agriculture? Common sense at once points out the remedy. Take from agriculture six hundred thousand men, women, and children, and you will at once give a market for more breadstuffs than all Europe now furnishes. In short, we have been too long subject to the policy of British merchants. It is time we should become a little more Americanized, and instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England, feed our own; or else in a short time, by continuing our present policy, we shall all be rendered to paupers ourselves.'—General Jackson's Letter to Dr. Coleman. [1824].

"When our manufactures are grown to a certain perfection, as they soon will be, under the fostering care of government, the farmer will find a ready market for his surplus produce, and—what is of equal consequence—a certain and cheap supply of all he wants; his prosperity will diffuse itself to every class of the community.'—Speech of Hon. J. C. Calhoun on the Tariff. [1816].

Revenue Lost Through Free-Trade.

"The question of revenue we will now briefly consider. For several years past the revenues of the government have been unequal to its expenditures, and consequently loan after loan, sometimes direct and sometimes indirect in form, has been resorted to. By this means a new national debt has been created, and is still growing on us with a rapidity fearful to contemplate—a rapidity only reasonably to be expected in time of war. This state of things has been produced by a prevailing unwillingness either to increase the Tariff or resort to direct taxation. But the one or the other must come. Coming expenditures must be met, and the present debt must be paid; and money cannot always be borrowed for these objects. The system of loans is but temporary in its nature, and must soon explode. It is a system not only ruinous while it lasts, but one that must soon fail and leave us destitute. As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and, next, no one left to borrow from, so must it be with a government.

"We repeat, then, that a Tariff sufficient for revenue, or a direct tax, must soon be resorted to; and, indeed, we believe this alternative is now denied by no one. But which system shall be adopted? Some of our opponents, in theory, admit the propriety of a Tariff sufficient for a revenue; but even they will not in practice vote for such a Tariff; while others boldly advocate direct taxation. Inasmuch, therefore, as some of them boldly advocate direct taxation, and all the rest—or so nearly all as to make exceptions needless—refuse to adopt the Tariff, we think it is doing them no injustice to class them all as advocates of direct taxation. Indeed, we believe they

are only delaying an open avowal of the system till they can assure themselves that the people will tolerate it.

"Let us, then, briefly compare the two systems. The Tariff is the cheaper system, because the duties, being collected in large parcels at a few commercial points, will require comparatively few officers in their collection; while by the direct-tax system the land must be literally covered with assessors and collectors, going forth like swarms of Egyptian locusts, devouring every blade of grass and other green thing. And, again, by the Tariff system the whole revenue is paid by the consumers of foreign goods, and those chiefly the luxuries, and not the necessaries, of life.

"By this system the man who contents himself to live upon the products of his own country pays nothing at all. And surely that country is extensive enough, and its products abundant and varied enough, to answer all the real wants of its people. In short, by this system the burden of revenue falls almost entirely on the wealthy and luxurious few, while the substantial and laboring many who live at home, and upon home products, go entirely free. By the direct tax system none can escape. However, strictly the citizen may exclude from his premises all foreign luxuries—fine cloths, fine silks, rich wines, golden chains, and diamond rings—still, for the possession of his house, his barn, and his homespun, he is to be perpetually haunted and harassed by the tax-gatherer. With these views we leave it to be determined whether we or our opponents are the more truly democratic on the subject."

Signed by A. Lincoln, S. T. Logan, A. T. Bledsoe. Dated March 4, 1843.

("Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln," Vol. 1, Pages 243-247).

Complete Endorsement of Protection.

In the introductory paragraph briefly stating the substance of the resolutions adopted by the committee, it is declared that Protective duties are "indispensably necessary to the prosperity of the American people." A more complete endorsement of the Protective system could not be made. This is followed by the quotations from the utterances of three eminent Democrats, made before the Tariff question became a party issue, and before the modern Democratic party espoused the cause of slavery, John C. Calhoun, who was a staunch Protectionist until 1828, when he changed his opinions in the interest of slaveholders; Thomas Jefferson, who as President signed the acts of Congress of March 27, 1804, March 3, 1807, and March 4, 1808, which increased duties and extended Protection to new industries. It was Jefferson who in his message to Congress in 1806 opposed reducing the Tariff to get rid of a surplus revenue. He said: "Shall we suppress the import and give that advantage to foreign over domestic indus-

tries?" Instead, however, of advising a reduction of Protective duties, he recommended the application of the surplus revenue to "public education, roads, rivers, canals, and such other objects of public improvement as it may be thought proper."

Jefferson a Defender of Protection.

During the eight years that he was President, Jefferson was one of the staunch defenders of Protection. In 1809 he wrote to Thomas Leiper, of Philadelphia, as follows:

"I have lately inculcated the encouragement of manufactures to the extent of our own consumption, at least in all articles of which we raise the raw material. On this, the Federal papers and meetings have sounded the alarm of the Chinese policy, destruction of commerce, etc. * * * This absurd hue and cry has contributed much to federalize New England; their doctrine goes to the sacrificing of agriculture and manufactures to commerce; to the calling all our people from the interior country to a seashore to turn merchants; and to convert this great agricultural country into a City of Amsterdam. But I trust the good sense of our country will see that its greatest prosperity depends on a due balance between agriculture, manufactures and commerce."

To Governor Jay, a little later, he wrote:

"An equilibrium of agriculture, manufactures and commerce is certainly becoming essential to our independence."

The third paragraph is from Andrew Jackson's famous letter to Dr. Coleman.

Two Systems Contrasted.

After distinctly approving the Protective system as means of developing the resources and industries of the country and making the people prosperous, the two systems, as methods of providing revenue for the national treasury, are considered and contrasted. In the outset it is stated that the Tariff for revenue only, adopted in 1833 and practiced until 1842, had proven a complete failure. This was the first trial which had been made of the Free-Trade plan. Its first effect was to greatly stimulate imports, which suddenly increased from \$108,000,000 in 1834 to \$176,000,000 in 1836. Within four years our imports exceeded our exports by \$99,000,000. The total balance of trade against us from 1834 to 1836 was \$116,332,000. A financial panic came in 1837. During the year of 1839 the adverse balance of trade, including the export of \$8,776,000 of specie, was about \$44,000,000. From 1839 to 1842 over \$10,000,000 of specie was exported; a foreign debt for merchandise purchased of over \$30,000,000 was created; the industries of the country were paralyzed, and a period of hard times set in which spread all over the country, and prosperity did not return until Protection was restored by

the act of 1842. From 1838 to 1842 there was a deficiency in the Treasury of \$22,590,000; from 1837 to 1841 the administration borrowed \$30,000,000. The public treasury was without credit and bankrupt. Unable to borrow money at home the Government sent Commissioners to Europe in 1840 with instructions to place a loan of \$12,000,000. The effort failed. The government then advertised for a popular loan, and only \$250,000 was offered by different parties at rates of interest ranging from 28 to 32 per cent. per annum. In 1841 the Speaker of the House of Representatives borrowed on his personal credit \$100,000 to loan to Congressmen in order that they might receive their salaries.

Hence, the administration was presented with the situation as stated by Mr. Lincoln:

"We repeat, then, that a Tariff sufficient for revenue, or a direct tax, must soon be resorted to."

Lincoln's Arguments Confirmed by Subsequent Events.

Mr. Lincoln then states that a resort to the system of direct taxation was then favored by the Democratic party and was inevitable if their Tariff system was restored. Rather than see the industries of the free States revived by Protection, they would leave them to perish and levy direct taxes for the support of the government. Mr. Lincoln had such a profound understanding, gained not only from the practical application of the Democratic plan between 1833 and 1842, but from the scientific principles upon which it is based, that he fully realized that it must fail whenever tried. Subsequent events have justified this contention.

The Tariff for revenue only, known as the Walker Tariff, passed in 1846, and reductions made by the act of 1857, brought about the same condition of the Treasury and so embarrassed Buchanan's administration that he found himself with a deficiency of \$70,000,000, a national debt increased by \$45,000,000, for money borrowed to pay the ordinary expenses of the government, and produced a period of hard times even worse than that of 1838 to 1842.

Buchanan Turned to Protection.

In his message to Congress of December, 1857, President Buchanan said: "Panic and distress of a fearful character prevail throughout the land. Our laboring population is without employment and consequently deprived of the means of earning their bread. Indeed all hope seems to have deserted the minds of men." Mr. Buchanan finally acquiesced in a return to Protection and signed the Morrill Tariff Bill, March 2, 1861.

Grover Cleveland had the same experience with a revenue Tariff, and was compelled to borrow \$250,000,000.

No Democratic President, however, has

been bold enough to resort to direct taxation in aid of a deficiency creating Free-Trade Tariff law until Woodrow Wilson gave it another trial, the burdens of whose policy are oppressing nearly every citizen, and whose tax assessors, as Lincoln said, "are going forth like swarms of Egyptian locusts, devouring every blade of grass and every green thing." Lincoln was a great prophet, but he was a great prophet because he understood the subject.

Those Who Pay Tariff Duties.

Mr. Lincoln then takes up the effect of the two systems on the consumers and shows that it is only the consumers of foreign made goods who pay any part of the duties levied; that by the Protective system "the man who contents himself to live on the products of his own country pays nothing at all," and then follows a recognition of the wonderful resources of our country and the capacity of our people in the statement: "And surely that country is extensive enough, and its products abundant and varied enough to answer all of the real wants of its people."

He then states that under the Protective system, "the burthen of revenue falls almost entirely on the wealthy and luxurious few, while the substantial and laboring many who live at home, and upon home products, go entirely free."

The importance to be attached to the Whig circular is found not alone in the fact that it contains an unqualified endorsement of the Protective policy, but the carefully considered discussion of the revenue features of the opposing Tariff policies. The objections to the Protective policy then being urged by the Free-Traders are specifically and completely answered.

Lincoln's Early Political Career.

Although living in the then remote and sparsely settled agricultural section of the country, his speeches and writings show that he was one of the best informed men of his time on all great questions pertaining to American politics. From the time of his entrance into public life, Central Illinois contained a group of men of great talent; leaders of both the Whig and Democratic parties, who in later years gained great distinction at the bar, on the bench, and in the halls of Congress. From among these sprang two conspicuous characters, Stephen A. Douglas, one of the greatest debaters that ever occupied a seat in the United States Senate, and who finally became the leader of the Northern wing of the Democratic party, and Abraham Lincoln. In those times political questions were the chief topic of discussion among men. Nearly every lawyer divided his time between law and politics. There were few newspapers, and, in the earlier years of Mr. Lincoln's career, no railroads or telegraphs.

Mr. Lincoln entered politics upon his return from the Black Hawk War in 1832, at the age of 23 years, as a candidate for the Illinois Legislature. Notwithstanding his defeat, he entered the field again and was elected to that body successively in 1834, 1836, 1838, and 1840. He was Presidential Elector on the Whig ticket in 1840, 1844, 1848, and in 1846 he was elected to Congress, serving one term. He received votes in the National Republican Convention of 1856 for the office of Vice-President. In 1844 he stumped the State of Illinois for Henry Clay. In 1848 he was called to Massachusetts and made speeches for the Whig party to counteract the influence of Henry Wilson, Charles Francis Adams, Charles Sumner, Stephen C. Phillips, E. Rockwood Hoar, Richard H. Dana, Jr., Anson Burlingame and John A. Andrews, who had revolted against the nomination of General Taylor. The Lowell Journal and Courier in its issue of September 18th, 1848, said of Mr. Lincoln's speech at that place:

"It was replete with good sense, sound reasoning and irresistible argument, and spoken with that perfect command of manner and matter which so eminently distinguishes the Western orators."

From the Legislature to the Presidency.

In 1843 he was a member of the Whig Central Campaign Committee of the State, and for many years was one of Illinois' most influential public men. He fought his way step by step from a member of the Legislature in 1835 to the Presidency in 1860. He was never for a moment out of politics. He was, year by year, extending his acquaintance, studying and mastering the great political questions of the day, and storing up information and reasoning out problems which enabled him in his great debate with Stephen A. Douglas in 1858, and in speeches which he delivered at Springfield, Columbus, Cincinnati, Cooper Institute and other places, to present the slavery question before the people of the United States in an entirely new aspect. It was Lincoln's ability as a constitutional lawyer that showed the American people how slavery could be arrested in its extension and finally extinguished under the Constitution of the United States.

When Lincoln Made More Speeches on the Tariff Than Any Other Subject.

The Tariff Campaigns of 1840, 1842 and 1844.

The campaigns of 1840, 1842 and 1844 were fought largely on the Tariff question. Illinois was a Democratic State, and Lincoln and his associates were striving to build up the Whig Party in order that a national bank, the system of internal improvements and a Protective Tariff might prevail throughout the country. Henry Clay was beaten for President in 1844 on all of these issues,

the Tariff being the most prominent, by James K. Polk. Clay lost New York and Michigan by the votes drawn off from the Whig Party by James G. Birney, the Abolitionist candidate. Besides, the Democrats carried Pennsylvania by a letter written by Polk declaring in favor of Protection. The rallying cry of the Democratic party was "Polk, Dallas, and the Tariff of 1842," asserting that Polk was as good a Tariff man as Henry Clay. As soon, however, as Polk was inaugurated, the mask was thrown off, and he emerged a Free-Trader. The Protective act of 1842 was repealed, and the revenue Tariff, known as the Walker Tariff of 1846, was enacted. Lincoln was elected to Congress in 1846, serving one term. He had been on the stump in the exciting campaigns of 1840, 1842 and 1844, and 1846, and as he says, "he made more speeches on the Tariff than on any other subject." Such was the political situation when, between the time of his election of 1846 and taking his seat in Congress, December 1, 1847, he wrote "Fragments of Tariff Discussion" ("Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln," edited by John G. Nicolay and John Hay, published by Francis D. Tandy Co., N. Y. Vol. 1, pages 300 to 315) as follows:

"Fragments of Tariff Discussion. Lincoln Had Studied, Weighed and Carefully Analyzed the Tariff Legislation of the United States."

"Whether the Protective policy shall be finally abandoned is now the question. Discussion and experience already had, and question now in greater dispute than ever. Has there not been some great error in the mode of discussion? Propose a single issue of fact, namely: From 1816 to the present, have Protected articles cost us more of labor during the higher than during the lower duties upon them? Introduce the evidence. Analyze this issue, and try to show that it embraces the true and whole question of the Protective policy. Intended as a test of experience. The period selected is fair, because it is a period of peace—a period sufficiently long (to) furnish a fair average under all other causes operating on prices, a period in which various modifications of higher and lower duties have occurred. Protected articles only are embraced. Show that these only belong to the question. The labor price only is embraced. Show this to be correct.

Effect of Duties Upon Prices.

"I suppose the true effect of duties upon prices to be as follows: If a certain duty be levied upon an article which by nature cannot be produced in this country, as three cents a pound upon coffee, the effect will be that the consumer will pay one cent more per pound than before, the producer will take one cent less and the merchant one cent less in profits; in other words, the

burden of the duty will (be) distributed over consumption, production and commerce, and not confined to either. But if a duty amounting to full Protection be levied upon an article which can be produced here with as little labor as elsewhere, as iron, that article will ultimately and at no distant day, in consequence of such duty, be sold to our people cheaper than before, at least, by the amount of the cost of carrying it from abroad.

Useless Labor.

"First as to useless labor. Before proceeding, however, it may be as well to give a specimen of what I conceive to be useless labor. I say, then, that all carrying, and incidents of carrying, of articles from the place of their production to a distant place for consumption, which articles could be produced of as good quality, in sufficient quantity and with as little labor at the place of consumption as at the place carried from, is useless labor. Applying this principle to our own country by an example, let us suppose that A and B are a Pennsylvania farmer and a Pennsylvania iron maker, whose lands are adjoining. Under the Protective policy A is furnishing B with bread and meat, and vegetables and fruits, and food for horses and oxen, and fresh supplies of horses and oxen themselves occasionally and receiving in exchange all the iron, iron utensils, tools and implements he needs. In this process of exchange each receives the whole of that which the other parts with, and the reward of labor between them is perfect; each receiving the product of just so much labor as he has himself bestowed on what he parts with for it. But the change comes. The Protective policy is abandoned, and A determines to buy his iron and iron manufactures of C in Europe. This he can only do by a direct or an indirect exchange of the produce of his farm for them. We will suppose the direct exchange is adopted. In this A desires to exchange ten barrels of flour—the precise product of one hundred days' labor—for the largest quantity of iron, etc., that he can get. C also wishes to exchange the precise product, in iron, of one hundred days' labor for the greatest quantity of flour he can get. In intrinsic value the things to be so exchanged are precisely equal.

Wasteful Transportation.

"But before this exchange can take place the flour must be carried from Pennsylvania to England and the iron from England to Pennsylvania. The flour starts. The wagoner who hauls it to Philadelphia takes a part of it to pay him for his labor; then a merchant there takes a little more for storage and forwarding commission, and another takes a little more for insurance; and then the shipowner carries it across the water and takes a little more of it for his

trouble. Still, before it reaches C it is tolled two or three times more for storage, drayage, commission, and so on; so when C gets it there are but seven and a half barrels of it left. The iron, too, in its transit from England to Pennsylvania goes through the same process of tolling, so that when it reaches A there are but three-quarters of it left. The result of this case is that A and C have each parted with one hundred days' labor and each received but seventy-five in return. That the carrying in this case was introduced by A ceasing to buy of B and turning (to) C; that it was utterly useless, and that it is ruinous in its effects upon A, are all little less than self-evident. "But," asks one, "if A is now only getting three-quarters as much iron from C for ten barrels of flour as he used to get of B, why does he not turn back to B?" The answer is: "B has quit making iron, and so has none to sell." "But why did B quit making?" "Because A quit buying of him, and he had no other customer to sell to." "But, surely, A did not cease buying of B with the expectation of buying of C on harder terms?" "Certainly not. Let me tell you how that was. When B was making iron as well as C, B had but one customer, this farmer A; C had four customers in Europe."

Falsity of the "Cheapest Market" Theory.

It seems to be an opinion very generally entertained that the condition of a nation is best whenever it can buy cheapest; but this is not necessarily true, because if, at the same time and by the same cause, it is compelled to sell correspondingly cheap, nothing is gained. Then it is said the best condition is when we can buy cheapest and sell dearest; but this again is not necessarily true, because with both these we might have scarcely anything to sell, or, which is the same thing, to buy with. To illustrate this, suppose a man in the present state of things is laboring the year round, at ten dollars per month, which amounts in the year to \$120. A change in affairs enables him to buy supplies at half the former price, to get fifty dollars per month for his labor, but at the same time deprives him of employment during all the months of the year, but one. In this case, though goods have fallen one-half, and labor risen five to one, it is still plain that at the end of the year the laborer is twenty dollars poorer than under the old state of things.

Value of Constant Employment.

These reflections show that to reason and act correctly on this subject we must look not merely to buying cheap, nor yet to buying cheap and selling dear, but also to having constant employment, so that we may have the largest possible amount of something to sell. This matter of employment can only be secured by an ample, steady, and certain

market to sell the products of our labor in.

But let us yield the point, and admit that by abandoning the Protective policy our farmers can purchase their supplies of manufactured articles cheaper than by continuing it; and then let us see whether, even at that, they will upon the whole be gainers by the change. To simplify this question, let us suppose the whole agricultural interest of the country to be in the hands of one man, who has one hundred laborers in his employ; the whole manufacturing interest to be in the hands of one other man, who has twenty laborers in his employ. The farmer owns all the plow and pasture land, and the manufacturer all the iron mines and coal banks and sites of water power. Each is pushing on his way, and obtaining supplies from the other so far as he needs—that is, the manufacturer is buying of the farmer all the cotton he can use in his cotton factory; all the wool he can use in his woolen establishment; all the bread and meats as well as all the fruits and vegetables which are necessary for himself and all his hands in all his departments; all the corn and oats and hay which are necessary for all his horses and oxen, as well as fresh supplies of horses and oxen themselves to do all his heavy hauling about his iron works and generally of every sort. The farmer in turn is buying of the manufacturer all the iron, iron tools, wooden tools, cotton goods, woolen goods, etc., that he needs in his business and for his hands.

Must Have Something to Buy With.

But after a while the farmer discovers that were it not for the Protective policy he could buy all of these supplies cheaper from a European manufacturer, owing to the fact that the price of labor is only one-quarter as high there as here. He and his hands are a majority of the whole, and, therefore, have the legal and moral right to have their interest first consulted. They throw off the Protective policy and the farmer ceases buying of the home manufacturer. Very soon, however, he discovers that to buy even at the cheaper rate requires something to buy with, and somehow or other he is falling down in this particular.

All Things Belong to Labor.

In the early days of our race the Almighty said to the first of our race "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread"; and since then, if we except the light and the air of heaven, no good thing has been or can be enjoyed by us without having first cost labor. And, inasmuch, as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things of right belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened in all the ages of the world that some have labored and

others have without labor enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any good government.

How Can Government Help?

But then, a question arises. How can a government best effect this? In our own country, in its present condition, will the Protective principle advance or retard this object? Upon this subject the habits of our whole species fall into three great classes—useful labor, useless labor and idleness. Of these the first only is meritorious, and to it all the products of labor rightfully belong; but the two latter, while they exist, are heavy pensioners upon the first, robbing it of a large portion of its just rights. The only remedy for this is to, so far as possible, drive useless labor and idleness out of existence. And first, as to useless labor. Before making war upon this, we must learn to distinguish it from the useful. It appears to me that all labor done directly and indirectly in carrying articles to the place of consumption, which could have been produced in sufficient abundance, with as little labor, at the place of consumption as at the place where they were carried from, is useless labor.

Needless Labor in Carrying.

Let us take a few examples of the application of this principle to our own country. Iron and everything made of iron can be produced in sufficient abundance, and with as little labor in the United States as anywhere else in the world, therefore, all labor done in bringing iron and its fabrics from a foreign country to the United States is useless labor. The same precisely may be said of cotton, wool and of their fabrics, respectively, as well as many other articles. While the uselessness of the carrying labor is equally true of all the articles mentioned, and of many others not mentioned, it is perhaps more glaringly obvious in relation to the cotton goods we purchase from abroad. The raw cotton from which they are made itself grows in our own country, is carried by land and by water to England, is there spun, woven, dyed, stamped, etc., and then carried back again and worn in the very country where it grew, and partly by the very persons who grew it. Why should it not be spun, weaved, etc., in the very neighborhood where it both grows and is consumed, and the carrying thereby dispensed with? Has nature interposed any obstacle? Are not all the agents—animal power, water power and steam power—as good and as abundant here as elsewhere? Will not as small an amount of human labor answer here as elsewhere? We may easily see that the

cost of this useless labor is very heavy. It includes not only the cost of actual carriage, but also the insurance of every kind, and the profits of the merchants through whose hands it passes. All these create a heavy burden necessarily falling upon the useful labor connected with such articles, either depressing the price to the producer or advancing it to the consumer, or, what is more probable, doing both in part.

Cotton as an Illustration.

A supposed case will serve to illustrate several points now to the purpose. A, in the interior of South Carolina, has one hundred pounds of cotton, which he supposes to be the precise product of one man's labor for twenty days. B, in Manchester, England, has one hundred yards of cotton cloth, the precise product of the same amount of labor. This lot of cotton and lot of cloth are precisely equal to each other in their intrinsic value. But A wishes to part with his cotton for the largest quantity of cloth he can get. B also wishes to part with his cloth for the greatest quantity of cotton he can get. An exchange is, therefore, necessary; but before this can be effected the cotton must be carried to Manchester and the cloth to South Carolina.

To Manchester and Back.

The cotton starts to Manchester. The man that hauls it to Charleston in his wagon takes a little out of it to pay him for his trouble; the merchant who stores it awhile before the ship is ready to sail takes a little out for his trouble; the shipowner who carries it across the water takes a little out for his trouble. Still, before it gets to Manchester it is tolled two or three times more for drayage, storage, commission, and so on, so that when it reaches B's hands there are but seventy-five pounds of it left. The cloth, too, in its transit from Manchester to South Carolina goes through the same process of tolling, so that when it reaches A there are but seventy-five yards of it. Now, in this case, A and B each have parted with twenty days' labor, and each received but fifteen in return. But let us suppose that B has removed to the side of A's farm in South Carolina, and has there made his lot of cloth. Is it not clear that he and A can then exchange their cloth and cotton, each getting the whole of what the other parts with?

Imposes a Direct Burden.

This supposed case of carrying 100 pounds of cotton to Manchester and bringing back 100 yards of cotton cloth to South Carolina shows the utter uselessness of the carrying labor in all similar cases, and also the direct burden it imposes upon useful labor. And whoever will take up the train of reflection suggested by this case and run it out to the full extent of its just ap-

plication, will be astonished at the amount of useless labor he will thus discover to be done in this very way. I am mistaken if it is not in fact many times over equal to all the real want in the world. This useless labor I would have discontinued, and those engaged in it added to the class of useful laborers. If I be asked whether I would destroy all commerce, I answer, Certainly not; I would continue it where it is necessary and discontinue it where it is not. An instance: I would continue commerce so far as it is employed in bringing us coffee, and I would discontinue it so far as it is employed in bringing us cotton goods.

Would the Farmer Be the Gainer?

But let us yield the point and admit by abandoning the Protective policy our farmers can purchase their supplies of manufactured articles cheaper than before; and then let us see whether, even at that, the farmers will upon the whole be gainers by the change. To simplify this question, let us suppose our whole population to consist of but twenty men. Under the prevalence of the Protective policy, fifteen of these are farmers, one is a miller, one manufactures iron, one implements from iron, one cotton goods, and one woolen goods. The farmers discover that, owing to labor only costing one-quarter as much in Europe as here, they can buy iron, iron implements, cotton goods and woolen goods cheaper when brought from Europe than when made by their neighbors. They are the majority, and therefore have both the legal and moral right to have their interest first consulted. They throw off the Protective policy and cease buying these articles of their neighbors. But they soon discover that to buy, and at the cheaper rate, requires something to buy with.

Nothing Doing at the Furnace.

Falling short in this particular, one of these farmers takes a load of wheat to the miller and gets it made into flour, and starts, as has been his custom, to the iron furnace. He approaches the well-known spot, but, strange to say, all is cold and still as death; no smoke rises, no furnace roars, no anvil rings.

After some search he finds the owner of the desolate place and calls out to him: "Come, Vulcan, don't you want to buy a load of flour?"

"Why," says Vulcan, "I am hungry enough, to be sure; haven't tasted bread for a week, but then you see my works are stopped and I have nothing to give you for your flour."

"But, Vulcan, why don't you go to work and get something?"

"I am ready to do so; will you hire me, farmer?"

"Oh, no; I could only set you to raising wheat; and you see I have more of

that already than I can get anything for."

"But give me employment and send your flour to Europe for a market."

"Why, Vulcan; how silly you talk. Don't you know they raise wheat in Europe as well as here, and labor is so cheap there as to fix the price of flour there so low as scarcely to pay the long carriage of it from here, leaving nothing whatever to me?"

"But, farmer, couldn't you pay to raise and prepare gardenstuffs and fruits, such as radishes, cabbages, Irish and sweet potatoes, cucumbers, water-melons and muskmelons, plums, pears, peaches, apples, and the like? All these are good things and used to sell well."

"So they did use to sell well, but it was to you we sold them, and now you tell us you have nothing to buy with. Of course, I cannot sell such things to the other farmers, because each of them raises enough for himself, and, in fact, rather wishes to sell than to buy. Neither can I send them to Europe for a market, because, to say nothing of European markets being stocked with such articles at lower prices than I can afford, they are of such a nature as to rot before they could reach there. The truth is, Vulcan, I am compelled to quit raising these things altogether, except a few for my own use, and this leaves part of my own time idle on my hands, instead of my finding employment for you."

Useless Labor as Bad as Idleness.

"If at any time all labor should cease and all existing provisions be equally divided among the people, at the end of a single year there could scarcely be one human being left alive; all would have perished by want of subsistence. So, again, if upon such division all that sort of labor which produces provisions should cease, and each individual should take up so much of his share as he could and carry it continually around his habitation, although in this carrying the amount of labor going on might be as great as ever, so long as it could last, at the end of the year the result would be precisely the same—that is, none would be left living.

"The first of these propositions shows that universal idleness would speedily result in universal ruin, and the second shows that useless labor is, in this respect, the same as idleness. I submit, then, whether it does not follow that partial idleness and partial useless labor would, in the proportion of their extent, in like manner, result in partial ruin; whether, if all should subsist upon the labor that one-half should perform, it would not result in very scanty allowance to the whole.

"Believing that these propositions and the conclusions I draw from them cannot be successfully controverted, I for the present assume their correctness,

and proceed to try to show that the abandonment of the Protective policy by the American Government must result in the increase of both useless labor and idleness, and so, in proportion, must produce want and ruin among our people."

Lincoln's Arguments Analyzed.

The "Fragments of Tariff Discussion" is an exceedingly valuable document, not alone because it contains Lincoln's views on some of the fundamental principles underlying the controversy, but for the plain, simple and original method employed in illustrating them. Lincoln had gone to the very root of the whole question, and discovered the true relation of domestic exchanges to the public welfare. He draws a clear distinction between domestic exchanges and foreign trade. He emphasizes the value of a home market over a foreign market, the importance of the employment of home labor instead of foreign labor, and the interdependence of one industry or occupation upon another as well as of individuals upon each other.

Protection Reduces Prices.

He even goes into some of the phases of the practical operation of Protective duties in their effect on prices, and points out the distinction in this respect between duties on articles not produced in the United States and on domestic production. As to the later, he says:

"But if a duty amounting to full Protection be levied upon an article which can be produced here with as little labor as elsewhere, as iron, that article will ultimately and at no distant day, in consequence of such duty, be sold to our people cheaper than before, at least, by the amount of the cost of carrying it from abroad."

The introductory paragraph shows that Lincoln based this statement upon the experience of the American people under the several Tariff laws from 1816 down to the time he wrote, that he considered only Protected articles; that the period covered was a period of peace and sufficiently long to furnish a fair average under all other causes operating on prices.

When the Greatest Progress Was Made.

Mr. Lincoln chose a period of peace for consideration, extending from the close of the War of 1812, to the time he wrote. Although certain manufactures had their beginning under the Tariff laws enacted prior to the War of 1812, and others were brought into existence during that struggle, the period covered by him embraces the years when the greatest progress was made in the establishment and growth of the manufactures of the United States. In 1789 we were a nation of farmers from Maine to Florida. In 1850 the census

of the United States of manufacturing industries showed an investment of capital of \$533,245,000; raw materials worked up \$555,000,000; male hands employed, 731,137; female hands employed, 225,922; wages paid, \$236,755,000; value of the production, \$1,019,106,616; 86 per cent. of which was produced in the fifteen free States. The manufactures consisted of the coarser and more ordinary sorts of commodities in common use among the people, and were as follows: Woolens, carpets, hosiery, cotton goods, glass, leather and manufactures of leather; boots and shoes, paper, hats, cabinet ware, furniture, manufactures from flax and hemp, silk, sugar, tobacco, candles, lead, red and white lead, buttons, certain chemicals, the production of pig and bar iron, castings, a great variety of manufactures from iron, and a great variety of other articles of less importance.

Confirmatory History On Decline in Prices.

It is a significant fact in support of Mr. Lincoln's statement that the great decline in prices of commodities took place in those articles which were made in the United States, while there was a very slight decline in the prices of those articles imported, which met with no competition in the American market. Ex-Governor Davis, of Massachusetts, referring to this fact in his speech before Congress, in 1828, said:

"Another circumstance which has a strong bearing upon this ought also to be mentioned. Goods which have been manufactured here have experienced a greater decline than those which we have not manufactured.

"Coarse and middling cassimers have fallen half, while the finest qualities have declined no more than 12½ per cent. These facts show that the foreign supplies of cloths have been forced into our market, and the effect has been to sink the price both here and in England. The progress of this decline has kept pace very accurately with the increase of business in this country. This struggle for the market could produce no other effect. The principal depression is occasioned by our competition with England."

Savings Through Protection.

Mr. Young, from Connecticut, in his speech before Congress the same year said:

"We know that coarse cotton cloths below about No. 25 have been fairly Protected; those from that to about No. 45 or 50 partially Protected; those above that very slightly, including what are termed, in our Tariff, cambrics, muslins, etc. And what has been the result? While the fine cottons, which include a greater proportion of labor, and should have fallen lower, have only fallen from 15 to 25 per cent. (not so much as your

agricultural produce in the same time), coarse cotton goods have fallen from 50 to 75 per cent. This case I have put for the double purpose of exemplifying the effects of our Protection and competition in those articles we manufacture, and of showing the use the foreigner makes of our market, so far as he supplies and controls it.

"I will give another instance, exemplifying the same effects, more palpable and decisive, probably. I allude to common crockery ware and common glassware, both imported and sold by the same class of merchants generally. Glass and glassware, we know, have received such Protection as to excite powerful competition. While the manufacture of common enameled and printed wares had as yet scarcely been attempted in this country, some brown wares and imitation Delphian wares have been common, and some new manufactories of porcelain are lately promising success. But the common Liverpool ware, as it is often called, has at all times occupied, commanded and controlled our market, and regulated its prices. And what has been the result? While one has hardly fallen 15 per cent., the other has, in many branches of it, fallen 75 per cent. And the opposers of this system, who complained so much of its injustice and oppression, are now actually saving 25 per cent. or more on their glasswares in consequence of this Protection, and losing the same amount on their earthen wares for the want of such Protection.

"Our coarse cottons are successfully competing with those of British manufacture. The greater mystery of our competition in foreign markets is that the English manufacturer cannot, and if he could, he will not (where he can avoid it) sell his goods at our present reduced prices, where he can command the market. The American manufacturer asks no better business than to sell his goods at the English market price, where the English manufacturer and merchant have the trade."

"How is it with the Georgia planter?" asked Mr. Wilde, of Georgia. "He sends a cargo of cotton and receives in return a cargo of cottons, woollens and hardware. But a duty is levied on the homeward cargo in the United States of 40 per cent. If he could contrive to throw this duty on the consumer, he might be able to get a fair remuneration for his slave labor, but he cannot. He is met in the United States by the domestic manufacturer. If he were to add the duty to the price of his goods the domestic manufacturer would undersell him.

A Few Instances Mentioned.

A few instances of the decline of the prices of cotton goods may be cited: Merrimac prints, which in 1855 averaged 25.07 cents per yard at the factory, declined to 16 cents in 1830, 12 cents in

1840, 10.90 cents in 1845, and 9.24 cents in 1850. The cotton fabrics made at Waltham, staple articles, were year by year reduced in price per yard as follows: 1816, 30 cents per yard; 1819, 21 cents; 1826, 13 cents; 1829, 8½ cents, and in 1843, had declined to 6½ cents per yard. The price of cotton machinery fell 320 per cent. from 1810 to 1830, all brought about by the establishment of manufactories in the United States, which came into competition with the foreign manufactures and forced down the price of foreign manufactures, and this continued to reduce the price more and more as the industries were developed and extended.

This was true of all of the industries which were established in the United States during this period under Protection high enough to secure to them the American market. From 1818 to 1830 the price of bar iron was reduced at Pittsburg from \$190 per ton to \$100 per ton; boiler iron from \$350 per ton to \$140 per ton; sheet iron from \$18.00 per hundredweight to \$8.50; hoop iron from \$250 to \$120; axes from \$24 per dozen to \$12 per dozen; brazier's rods in 1824 were imported at a cost of \$313 per ton, and in 1831 sold for \$130. In 1816 the American people were importing nails from Great Britain and paying 16 cents a pound, and a duty of 5 cents a pound was imposed, and by 1830 the entire American market was being supplied at 6½ cents a pound.

Lincoln Opposed to Foreign Trade in Competing Commodities. We Should Supply the American Market with Goods Made in American Industries by American Labor.

"If it be asked," says Lincoln, "whether I would destroy all commerce, I answer certainly not. I would continue it where it is necessary and discontinue it where it is not. An instance, I would continue commerce so far as it is employed in bringing us coffee, and I would discontinue it so far as it is employed in bringing us cotton goods."

Here Lincoln attacked the vitals of Free-Trade. The traders of the world, those who buy in one country to sell in another, as well as the foreign manufacturer, never objected to our imposing duties on tea, coffee, spices, and those natural products the like of which cannot be produced at home. These things we must have and will have, whether made dutiable or not. But when we impose Protective duties on cotton goods, woollens, manufactures of iron and other articles for the purpose of causing their production at home, then foreign commerce is interfered with, and a great hue and cry is raised that Protection "destroys commerce." Importers are deprived of commissions, foreign manufacturers of profits, ship owners of freight rates, bankers of discounts, and exchange, and the marine insurance com-

panies of premiums; so all of these interests favor the sending of iron, copper, lead, cotton, wool, timber and all of the raw materials which we produce across the Atlantic Ocean to be there manufactured into the finished products which are then to be sold to us, with all of the profits and expenses of these middlemen added to the price. These same great captains of foreign commerce also desire that the raw materials of all countries be also shipped to the great manufacturing centers of the Old World that all of the manufacturing be done there.

What Lincoln Called "Useless Labor."

The enormous expense of transporting raw materials from the United States to foreign countries and bringing back the finished products, which Lincoln calls "useless labor," he would have abolished by excluding the foreigner from our market and forcing the manufacturing to be done in American mills by American labor, thereby securing to American labor and capital all of the profits and compensation for effecting every step in the process of production, manufacture, transportation and marketing. By this means, a vast home trade would be built up; the spendable income of the people multiplied; the country flourish and grow by industrial effort, and the people become enriched and independent by retaining among themselves the fruits of their own industry. Useless labor would be abolished by dispensing with needless transportation, and idleness would be abolished by keeping the American people employed. Lincoln well understood that the true source of a nation's wealth and power was the development and utilization of its own natural resources, its land, its mines, the machinery, the waterpowers, and the full employment of its labor, and the conduct of all of its business by its own people.

HOME TRADE IS MORE VALUABLE TO A NATION THAN FOREIGN TRADE.

Lincoln's Famous Epigram.

The editor of the *Harvard Independent* (Harvard, Illinois), on June 9, 1894, said: "Abraham Lincoln's first speech on the Tariff question was short and to the point. He said that he did not pretend to be learned in political economy, but he thought he knew enough to know that 'when an American paid Twenty Dollars for steel to an English manufacturer, America had the steel and England had the Twenty Dollars. But when he paid Twenty Dollars for steel to an American manufacturer, America had both the steel and the Twenty Dollars.' That was the sum and substance of the Tariff question as he viewed it."

Adam Smith in 1776.

We may write pages on the subject; we may quote Adam Smith, Sir John Barnard Byles, the writings of Henry

C. Carey, or the speeches of Thomas B. Reed, and prove the proposition by arguments and statistics, yet for a simple, plain and convincing statement of the great fact, we must revert to Lincoln's epigram. The epigram had been quoted so many times without its authenticity having been questioned, that the writer used it in "The Industrial Development of Nations," (published in 1912), firmly believing that it was genuine and without the slightest intimation from any source to the contrary. It appears now that doubt has been thrown on its genuineness, yet it has not been shown that these words were ever uttered by any person other than Abraham Lincoln. Both Professor F. W. Taussig and Mr. D. M. Matteson of Harvard University made a great endeavor to trace the phrase to its origin and discover evidence to establish that it was not uttered by Lincoln. Prof. Taussig in an article entitled "Abraham Lincoln on the Tariff—a Myth," published in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August 19, 1914, says that "the first mention which we have found is in the *AMERICAN ECONOMIST*." He then states that the *AMERICAN ECONOMIST* on June 29, 1894, published it as having been copied from the *Howard Independent* of Howard, Illinois, on June 9, 1894. It having been ascertained that there was no such paper as "The Howard Independent" and being unable to find a reference to it in any of the published works on Lincoln, it was concluded by Prof. Taussig that the whole story was "a myth." Upon further investigation; however, he discovered that the word "Howard" as used in the *American Economist* was a misprint, and that the article first appeared in the *Harvard Independent* of Harvard, Illinois, on June 9, 1894. (See "Lincoln on the Tariff—a Sequel" by F. W. Taussig. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, February, 1915).

It should be noted, however, that in these articles written by Prof. Taussig, and in the criticisms made by others on the use which was being made of the epigram by attributing it to Abraham Lincoln, no question was raised but that Lincoln was in fact a Protectionist, it being contended simply that sufficient proof has not been found to justify a claim that Abraham Lincoln ever uttered the words attributed to him. The writer of this article made an investigation of the subject to ascertain who wrote the editorial for the *Harvard Independent* of June 9, 1894. He visited the village of Harvard (McHenry County), Illinois, late in January, 1916; called at the printing office and interviewed Mr. M. J. Emerson, the present editor and proprietor of the paper. In the printing office he saw a copy of the *Independent* which contained the editorial, and ascertained that the article in question was written by Otis S. Eastman, deceased, and later received from Mr. Emerson a letter, of which the following is a copy:

"Established 1866.

"Harvard Independent.

"M. J. Emerson, Editor and Proprietor.

"Harvard, Illinois, March 3, 1916.

"Hon. George B. Curtiss, Binghamton, New York. My dear Mr. Curtiss: Am sending under separate cover a copy of the Harvard Independent of May 27, 1897, containing the obituary notice of Mr. Otis S. Eastman.

"I was personally acquainted with said Mr. Eastman for a period of twenty years. He was appointed my legal guardian in July, 1888. I have positive knowledge of the fact that he was the editor of the Harvard Independent in June, 1894; that he was the sole editor of said paper at that time, and that he wrote the editorial published therein on June 9, 1894, of which the following is an exact copy:

"'Abraham Lincoln's first speech on the Tariff question was short and to the point. He said that he did not pretend to be learned in political economy, but he thought that he knew enough to know that "when an American paid twenty dollars for steel to an English manufacturer, America had the steel and England had the twenty dollars. But when he paid twenty dollars for steel to an American manufacturer, America had both the steel and the twenty dollars." That was the sum and substance of the Tariff question as he viewed it.'

"Mr. Eastman was a great student of the Tariff question and of politics and was a very learned and capable man. He was a lifelong Republican and an enthusiastic Protectionist.

"Mr. Eastman died at Harvard, McHenry County, Illinois, on May 23, 1897.

"Trusting that the above information will be of some use to you, and assuring you that if I can be of any further service to you in this matter, please have no hesitancy in advising me, and I will endeavor to attend to the same with more promptness than I did in this one.

"With kindest regards, and best wishes for the successful completion of your work on the Tariff, I beg to remain, Yours very truly,

"M. J. EMERSON."

In the above letter we have conclusive proof that the editorial containing the epigram was written by Otis S. Eastman, "a great student of the Tariff question and of politics and a very learned and capable man."

Who, Then, Was Otis S. Eastman?

Who, then, was Otis S. Eastman, who made this important statement of words uttered by Abraham Lincoln? Upon the decease of Mr. Eastman, which occurred on May 23, 1897, the Harvard Independent on the following Thursday, May 27, published the following obituary account of his life and character:

"Otis S. Eastman Passed Away.

"An Honored Career.

"Well Known Newspaper Man and Former Editor of the Independent.

"Otis S. Eastman died at his home in this city last Sunday morning, after a lingering illness of over two years, aged 64 years.

"The deceased was born in Benton, N. H., Feb. 10, 1833, and moved to Manchester, that State, in March, 1845, graduating from the High School in 1850. At the age of 17 years he entered the Union-Democrat office in Manchester and learned the printer's trade. He worked in the Boston Pathfinder office with Charles F. Brown (Artemus Ward) and B. P. Shillaber (Ma'am Partington) and was afterward employed on the Boston daily papers. He learned the book and press department in the book office of Allen & Farnham in Cambridge, Mass., and had charge of the press department of Thurston & Torrey in Boston, where Ticknor, Fields & Co. had their printing done. He went to New York City in 1854, having charge of Holman & Gray's press department of Putnam's Magazine. Later he returned to Boston and had charge of the Franklin Printing House from 1861 to 1865, printing the Atlantic Monthly. He came West in 1866, working the year previous to that in the University printing office of Cambridge, Mass. On arriving in Illinois he purchased the Fairbury Journal, which he published seven years, returning to New Hampshire in 1873. A year later he established the Journal in Suncook, N. H., which he published nine years. He went to Washington, D. C., in 1883 and was employed in the document room of the Government Printing Office until Cleveland's first election, in 1884, when he resigned. From June, 1885, to October of the same year he was connected with the Niles, Michigan, Republican. In October, 1885, he purchased the Harvard Independent of N. B. Burch. He published this paper nearly ten years, selling out to the present firm the latter part of August, 1895.

"Mr. Eastman was married to Rachel A. Dimick in 1855, by whom he had two sons, Charles O. and Frederick L. The latter died in Fairbury, in 1873, aged 12 years. Mrs. Eastman died in Manchester in March, 1876, and Charles passed away in the same city five years later, aged 23 years.

"The deceased was married to Harriet M. Miles in Manchester, Nov. 10, 1885. His wife and two sons, Otis M. and Jesse O., survive him.

"He joined the Masonic fraternity in New York City in 1855, the Royal Arch Chapter in Fairbury, Ill., in 1870, and Trinity Commandery, Knights Templar, in Manchester, in 1876.

"Mr. Eastman's life was an open book, to be read of all men. He was a staunch and fearless friend, frank and manly in his every act and expression. He scorned duplicity in any form, because he was the soul of truthfulness, and was wont to visit the severest condemnation upon those who practiced it toward himself or his friends. Socially he was of the most

kindly nature, and while keen of observation, rarely saw anything to censure in those to whom he had given his confidence. His friendship once given he was always loth to believe any evil of the person upon whom it was bestowed, and he never withdrew unless under great provocation and only after irrefragible proof of the unworthiness of the object of it.

"In his family relations Mr. Eastman was resplendent. The wealth of his large heart went out to those immediately surrounding him with a largesse seldom equaled, and only those who have witnessed the unaffected manifestation of affection for those embraced within the charmed circle of his home could appreciate his rare nature. They were all in all to him. In their presence his eyes beamed with love and his voice was attuned to the sweetest sympathy. However stern and unyielding he might be to others, he was led captive by his wife and children, and their wishes his law. Death, inexorable death has bereft his friends and family of one who was very dear to them, but the influence of his life will be a benediction to all of them, and his memory one of their richest blessings.

Statement Was Not Fabricated.

The high character of Mr. Eastman at once acquits him of any suspicion of having fabricated the statement, or published it without evidence which justified him in believing that he was correctly quoting Lincoln's words. It should be noted that for six years, from 1866 to 1873, he published a newspaper at Fairbury, Livingston County, Illinois, which was located not far from Springfield and in the district throughout which Lincoln made many speeches early in his career upon the Tariff issue. Mr. Eastman does not say that the words were uttered in Lincoln's "first speech" but in his "first speech on the Tariff." It is a well known fact that the anecdotes, sayings and doings of Abraham Lincoln were quoted and talked about by the people of Central Illinois from the time he became President, until those who knew him personally or had heard him speak passed away. In fact his fame has grown and spread until the whole civilized world has become interested in his life and character. The fact that the statement does not appear in any of the written or published reports of his speeches and writings does not militate against its genuineness, for but very few of the stump speeches of Lincoln or Douglas or Clay, or in fact any of the Western statesmen of that age and period, were published. This utterance was probably handed down by tradition (as many other sayings of Lincoln have been), and Mr. Eastman was informed of it by some one who heard Lincoln say it. This, however, is to be said of it: it sounds like Lincoln, it is Lincolnian in style, and

in this respect it is like other sayings of the man which have come down to us by tradition. Moreover, the epigram is characteristic of the great emancipator; it reads like one of his statements of a great truth expressed in plain and simple language. Mr. Bryan said of Lincoln:

"He was a master of the power of statement. Few have equaled him in the ability to strip a truth of surplus verbiage and present it in its naked strength. He could state a question so clearly that one could hardly misunderstand it, when he wanted to."

Henry Clay embellished his great utterances with adjectives and beautiful words. Webster's great expressions, although many of them were short and to the point, were delivered in a style which was characterized as Websterian, and so there was an individuality about Lincoln's epigrams that is unmistakable. This questioned epigram, if submitted to one hundred students of Lincoln's style for decision as to the name of the author, would almost unanimously at once say Lincoln. Moreover, Lincoln had made a profound study, as is shown in "Fragments of Tariff Discussion," of the very phase of the Tariff question elucidated by the epigram. He had considered fully the value to a nation of buying at home instead of buying abroad. Hence it is fair to conclude that until it is established by competent evidence that the epigram was uttered by some person other than Lincoln, we shall believe that Mr. Eastman's statement is true.

The idea embodied in this epigram is not new. The great fact which it contains was pointed out by Adam Smith in his lectures late in the Eighteenth Century. It is immaterial in illustrating the fact, whether one uses "money" in exchange for goods, or whether it is assumed that in trade indirectly goods are paid for with goods. For if an American exchanges twenty dollars' worth of wheat with an English manufacturer for twenty dollars' worth of manufactured goods, England has the wheat and America has the goods, but when he exchanges the twenty dollars' worth of wheat with a Massachusetts manufacturer for twenty dollars' worth of woolen goods, America has both the wheat and the woolen goods. Adam Smith carried the argument to the point of showing how home exchanges are most beneficial to a nation. It is an old Protectionist argument that by a system of home trade under Protection, the United States would become a world within itself, and as the fruits of the industry of the people were kept at home, they would constantly multiply and grow, and ultimately the people of the United States would have a larger spendable income each year than the people of any nation practicing Free-Trade. In discussing the proposition in his "Wealth of Nations," Adam Smith said (Wealth of Nations, Book II, Chapter 5):

"The capital which is employed in purchasing in one part of the country in order to sell in another the produce of the industry of that country, generally replaces by such operation two distinct capitals that had both been employed in the agriculture or manufacture of that country, and thereby enables them to continue that employment. When both are the produce of domestic industry, it necessarily replaces, by every such operation, two distinct capitals, which had both been employed in supporting productive labor, and thereby enables them to continue that support. The capital which sends Scotch manufacturers to London, and brings back English manufacturers and corn to Edinburg, necessarily replaces, by every such operation, two British capitals, which had both been employed in the agriculture or manufactures of Great Britain.

"The capital employed in purchasing foreign goods for home consumption, when this purchase is made with the product of domestic industry, replaces, too, by every such operation, two distinct capitals, but one of them only is employed in supporting domestic industry. The capital which sends British goods to Portugal, and brings back Portuguese goods to Great Britain, replaces by every such operation only one British capital. The other is a Portuguese one. Though the returns, therefore, of the foreign trade of consumption should be as quick as those of the home trade, the capital employed in it will give but one-half the encouragement to the industry or productive labor of the country.

"A capital, therefore, employed in the home trade, will sometimes make twelve operations, or be sent out and returned twelve times, before a capital employed in the foreign trade of consumption has made one. If the capitals are equal, therefore, the one will give four-and-twenty times more encouragement and support to the industry of the country than the other."

Sir John Bernard Byles, in 1849.

The economic principle which forms the basis of the advantage derived from the policy of Protection stated by Adam Smith, was elucidated and developed by Sir John Barnard Byles, in 1849, in the following able and comprehensive discussion:

"What does Adam Smith mean by the expression, 'replace capital'? It is an expression not to be passed over in haste, but well deserving to be attentively considered and analyzed.

"He means that the whole value of a commodity is spent in its production, and yet reappears in the shape of the new product. That in its production there is an expenditure not of the profit merely, but of the entire value, and that the whole of that expenditure not only

maintains landlords, tenants, tradesmen and work people, but furnishes an effective demand and market for other productions. He means that the clear gain, the spendable revenue, the net income of the producing nation, is increased by the amount of the entire value of the domestic product, and that the nation is so much the richer; for while producing, it spends the entire gross value, and, nevertheless, after it has produced, it yet has the entire gross value left in another shape.

"He then goes on and says that if with British commodities you purchase British commodities you replace two British capitals; but if with British commodities you purchase foreign commodities you replace only one British capital. That is to say, you might have had the entire gross value of two industries to spend, and thereby also to create and sustain markets; but you are content to have the value and the market of one industry alone.

"These observations of Adam Smith, though demonstrably true, derive additional weight from the quarter from which they come. They are the admissions of the founder of the existing school of political economists, on a point of vital importance, so vital that it affects the entire theory of Free-Trade.

"At the risk, therefore, of being charged with prolixity and repetition, I venture to invite, the candid and serious attention of the reader to a further consideration of this problem.

"The entire price or gross value of every home made article constitutes net gain, net revenue, net income to British subjects. Not a portion of the value, but the whole value, is resolvable into net gain, income or revenue maintaining British families, and creating or sustaining British markets. Purchase British articles with British articles and you create two such aggregate values and two such markets for British industry.

"Change your policy—purchase foreign articles with British articles—and you now create only one value for your own benefit instead of creating two, and only one market for British industry instead of two. You lose by the change of policy the power of spending the entire value of one industry, which you might have had, as well as the other, and you lose a market for British industry to the full extent of the expenditure of that superseded industry.

"A small difference in price may cause the loss, but will not compensate the nation for that loss. For example, suppose England can produce an article for 100 pounds and can import it for 99 pounds. By importing it instead of producing it she gains 1 pound; but though she pay for it with her own manufactures, she loses (not, indeed, by the exchange itself, but by the collapse of the suspended industry) 100 pounds of

wealth which she might have had to spend by creating the value at home; that is to say, on the balance she loses 99 pounds which she might have had in addition by producing both commodities at home.

"Nor can it be said that what the producer loses the consumer gains. The producer loses 100 pounds, the consumer gains 1 pound. The nation, moreover, loses the markets which that superseded industry supported."

Equal Amounts of Industry.

The relative value to a nation of domestic trade and foreign trade has been one of the chief points in controversy between Protectionists and Free-Traders ever since opposition to Protection was introduced. It occupied a prominent place in the debates on the subject between 1830 and 1846, when Lincoln was giving so much attention to the Tariff question. The Free-Traders, at a convention held in Philadelphia in 1831, contended in their resolutions adopted, that the exchange of domestic goods for foreign goods (in foreign commerce) promotes or puts in motion two equal amounts of industry, one foreign and the other domestic. The Protectionists, in their memorial issued the same year, replying to the declaration of the Free-Trade convention, asserted that even if this be true, and if all foreign trade was carried on by an exchange of commodities, still it is not worth more than one-half as much to a nation as domestic exchanges or home trade, for domestic or internal trade also promotes, or puts in motion, two equal amounts of industry, both domestic, and that it employs, of course, twice as much domestic capital and labor as the other.

Ninety Per Cent. Is Labor.

It should be borne in mind that directly or indirectly 90 per cent. of the value of every commodity produced, represents labor distributed among producers from the first human effort until the product is finished. In its distribution a commodity is packed, shipped, handled, and sold by labor which must be rewarded for its efforts at every step that is taken until it is delivered to the consumer. And labor does not stop here. Effort is required to cook and prepare food for the table. To trace to the bottom the cost price of every commodity, to the consumer, we find that it constitutes net spendable income.

This great economic principle goes to the root of the controversy. It was by the exchange of the produce of the American farm for domestic manufactures that the American people had accumulated their wealth and reached the stage of development which they enjoyed. It was by such internal trade that the State of Massachusetts alone, in 1840, consumed of the food products and raw materials of other States an amount

worth \$40,000,000. Five million dollars' worth of raw cotton, produced by the State of South Carolina, exchanged for \$5,000,000 worth of manufactured goods made in the State of Virginia, would have added \$10,000,000 to the spendable incomes of the people of the two States; but \$5,000,000 worth of cotton exported to England and exchanged for a like value of manufactured goods made there would have added \$5,000,000 to the spendable income of South Carolina and \$5,000,000 to the spendable income of England. But this is not all. England by converting the \$5,000,000 worth of cotton into fabrics would have increased its value fourfold and exported it to other countries for \$20,000,000. The wealth and spendable income of the English people would have been increased by \$15,000,000; besides, her merchants, who imported the cotton and marketed the fabrics, would have received commissions and profits; her insurance companies would have assumed the risks and received premiums; further, her ships would have made a profit by the cost of carriage both ways. Apply this principle to all the productions of our country and we find the great underlying cause of England's commercial greatness and the reasons why Americans should have fabricated for themselves and turned the profits to their own account.

Another Great Lesson.

Moreover, another great lesson may be drawn from the above example. Had the \$5,000,000 worth of cotton been converted into cloth in the United States by the two operations, the spendable income of our people would have been increased by \$20,000,000; and American merchants, railroads and insurance companies would all have been supported.

A nation which exports raw materials and crude products to a distant market, there to be converted into finished productions by the addition of labor and enterprise of foreigners, subjects the people to a still greater loss. Thomas B. Reed, in his great speech in opposition to the Wilson bill on February 1, 1894, illustrated this proposition when he said:

"Let me give one item, and the figures shall be furnished by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Wheeler), who told me in your presence that the value of all the cotton raised in the United States was only \$300,000,000, while the finished product of that cotton was \$1,750,000,000. When cotton leaves the field it is worth \$300,000,000; when it leaves the mill it is worth six times as much. On our own cotton crop alone we might in time make the profits on a billion and a half of manufactured goods. Nor is there anything to prevent such a result in a Protective Tariff."

Lincoln Predicts Disaster from the Walker Tariff of 1846.

In the concluding paragraph of "Frag-

ments of Tariff Discussion," Mr. Lincoln said:

"The abandonment of the Protective policy by the American Government must result in the increase of both useless labor and idleness, and so, in proportion, must produce want and ruin among the people."

This prediction was verified in 1857, for, notwithstanding the fact that following the overthrow of Protection by the adoption of a Free-Trade Tariff law in 1846, many causes intervened which operated to stimulate trade and industry, the system broke down in 1857 and brought upon the country a persistent and widespread period of hard times which continued until Protection was restored by the passage of the Merrill Tariff law of 1861. Gold was discovered in California in 1848, and from that time until 1860, \$651,250,000 of gold was produced from its mines. Yet it did not remain in the country; \$406,519,000 was sent abroad to settle an adverse balance of trade of \$491,753,000 incurred by the purchase of foreign manufactures. At the same time 26,340 miles of railroads were built at an expenditure of \$996,025,860 for labor and materials, and 50,000 miles of telegraph lines were built. Steamships at this time were to a great extent substituted for sailing vessels; yet our manufacturing industries did not thrive. They were checked in their growth and finally went down under the pressure of foreign competition, producing idleness, want and ruin among the people.

Greatness and Youth Combined.

Lincoln was one of the greatest debaters and public speakers of all times. His oratory, like that of Demosthenes, convinced the people, moulded and crystallized public opinion and arrested the attention of the country, not so much on the man as on the subject which he discussed. He never over-stated the case, but always spoke and wrote with moderation, eliminating nonessentials. As Jusserand, the French Ambassador, said of him, "He said the right thing." He was always a master of his subject. He was thoroughly informed, honest and earnest. His great purpose was always to have the question at issue settled right. His opinions and beliefs deep-rooted, sprang from a thorough knowledge of the facts ascertained, sifted, discriminated, balanced and weighed on the scales of justice, right and public welfare.

His superior genius, strength of mind and wisdom were recognized by his associates long before he became a national character. His faculty for sound reasoning and correct thought seems to have been a part of him from his youth. There is no day or year or time in his life which can be pointed out when it may be said of him that he changed his views and became converted to this or that

doctrine. His conception of sound economic principles, of wise public policies and great moral truths, is disclosed by his earliest speeches and writings. In 1837, when he was 28 years of age, he signed and presented a protest to the Illinois Legislature which declared that he believed that **"the institution of slavery is founded on both injustice and bad policy"** and that **"the Congress of the United States has power under the Constitution to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia."**

Two Great Principles.

It was these two great principles, that slavery was wrong and that Congress had under the Constitution the exclusive power to abolish or prohibit it on all waters and in all of the places and territories under the jurisdiction of the United States, and to prohibit the trade in slaves between the States as well as with foreign countries, so early announced by Mr. Lincoln, which constituted the two great fundamental principles upon which the Republican party nineteen years later was organized, and the triumph of which, in the election of Lincoln in 1860, precipitated the secession of the Southern States and culminated in the abolition of slavery, forever settling the question that we are a nation and not a confederation of sovereign States. It was the question of jurisdiction of Congress over the subject under the Constitution, which split the Democratic party in 1860 into the Northern and Southern wings, led respectively by Douglas and Breckenridge. The protest was presented to the legislature the same year that Lovejoy was murdered at Alton on account of his anti-slavery views, and against a resolution of the legislature condemning anti-slavery societies. At this time anti-slavery doctrines were unpopular in Illinois. The State was overwhelmingly Democratic. Hence Lincoln started in life as a member of a minority party and espoused a cause and political doctrines which were then unpopular.

The Whigs Beaten Out On the Tariff Question.

In October, 1859, Lincoln wrote the following letter to Dr. Wallace:

"Clinton, October 11, 1859.

"My Dear Sir: I am here just now attending court. Yesterday before I left Springfield, your brother, Dr. William S. Wallace, showed me a letter of yours, in which you kindly mention my name, inquire for my Tariff views, and suggest the propriety of my writing a letter upon the subject. I was an old Henry Clay-Tariff-Whig. In old times I made more speeches on that subject than any other.

"I have not since changed my views. I believe yet, if we could have a moderate, carefully adjusted Protective Tariff, so far acquiesced in as not to be a per-

petual subject of political strife, squabbles, changes, and uncertainties, it would be better for us. Still it is my opinion that just now the revival of that question will not advance the cause itself or the man who revives it.

"I have not thought much on the subject recently, but my general impression is that the necessity for a Protective Tariff will ere long force its old opponents to take it up; and then its old friends can join in and establish it on a more firm and durable basis. We, the old Whigs, have been entirely beaten out on the Tariff question, and we shall not be able to re-establish the policy until the absence of it shall have demonstrated the necessity for it in the minds of men heretofore opposed to it. With this view, I should prefer to not now write a public letter on the subject. I therefore wish this to be considered confidential. I shall be very glad to receive a letter from you. Yours truly,
A. Lincoln."

("Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln," Vol. V. Pages 256-257.)

Yes, the Whig Party had been "beaten out on the Tariff question." It had been beaten out on the "National Bank," and it had been beaten out on the question of internal improvements. But these great public policies were not dead, and Lincoln had not lost hope, for he believed that the absence of Protection would in time "demonstrate the necessity for it in the minds of men heretofore opposed to it."

The Slavery Controversy Eliminated the Tariff from Political Discussion.

When Lincoln wrote his "Fragments of Tariff Discussion" the Mexican War was in progress, yet he evidently believed at that time that the Tariff controversy was not settled. But questions growing out of the Mexican War suddenly changed the entire course of political discussion and brought the conflict over slavery to the front as the all-absorbing topic of debate. All other questions, the Tariff, the national bank and the policy of internal improvements, were laid aside until the Republican party took control of the Government in 1860. Through the Mexican War a vast domain was added to our territory. The triumph of our armies, the valor of our soldiers and the glamor of military achievement added greatly to the popular prestige and strength of the Democratic party. Although Lewis Cass, its candidate for President, was defeated in 1848, and General Taylor elected through the revolt of the Free Soil Democrats led by Van Buren, it swept the country in the elections of 1852 and 1856. The great compromise of 1850, which was accepted by so many as a settlement of the slavery question, brought about the election of Pierce in 1852, and the endorsement of the popular sovereignty doctrine carried Buchanan through in 1856.

No Room for Tariff Discussion.

The annexation of Texas and the extension of slavery territory to the Pacific ocean, the defeat of the Wilmot Proviso in 1846, the passage of the fugitive slave law in 1850, the repeal of the Missouri Compromise in 1854, and the decision in the Dred Scott case in 1857, and the avowed purpose of the slaveholders to force slavery into all of the territories of the northwest, aroused the people of the free States in resistance to extension and in defense of the territory dedicated to freedom in 1820. The discussion was carried into the churches, schools and the homes; the old political parties were disrupted; the anti-slavery Whigs, uniting with the Abolitionists and the Free Soil Democrats, formed the Republican party in 1854 and ran Fremont for President in 1856.

At the very time when the Tariff act of 1857 was before Congress, Kansas was a scene of conflict and bloodshed; the whole country was aroused to a high pitch of excitement, and on March 3, 1857, the day that this act was signed by the President, the people were anxiously waiting for the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Dred Scott case, which was made public three days later. The Kansas struggle, which began in the fall of 1854, had grown more threatening. Emigrant aid societies in the North were sending anti-slavery men into the territory to make it a free State, and from over the Missouri border pro-slavery men were rushing in to force the adoption of a slavery Constitution. The people of the free States, under these conditions of great political excitement and threatened civil war, had no room for Tariff discussion.

Protection was simply being held in abeyance until the slavery question was settled.

Tariff Question Must Come Up Again.

In his speech at New Haven, Connecticut, March 6, 1860, Lincoln said:

"Mr. President and Fellow Citizens of New Haven: If the Republican party of this nation shall ever have the National House intrusted to its keeping, it will be the duty of that party to attend to all the affairs of national housekeeping. Whatever matters of importance may come up, whatever difficulties may arise, in the way of its administration of the government, that party will then have to attend to; it will then be compelled to attend to other questions besides this question which now assumes an overwhelming importance—the question of slavery. It is true that in the organization of the Republican party this question of slavery was more important than any other; indeed, so much more important has it become that no other national question can even get a hearing just at present. The old question of Tariff—a matter that will remain one of the chief affairs of national housekeeping to all time; the question of

the management of financial affairs; the question of the disposition of the public domain; how shall it be managed for the purpose of getting it well settled, and of making there the homes of a free and happy people—these will remain open and require attention for a great while yet, and these questions will have to be attended to by whatever party has the control of the government. Yet just now they cannot even obtain a hearing, and I do not purpose to detain you upon these topics, or what sort of hearing they should have when opportunity shall come. For whether we will or not, the question of slavery is the question, the all-absorbing topic, of the day.”—(Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln,” Vol. V. Pages 339-340.)

The Election of Abraham Lincoln and the Return to Protection.

The slavery question was regarded by Lincoln of such paramount importance that he did not think that the Tariff question should be agitated in the Chicago Convention. To Dr. Edward Wallace he wrote in May, 1860:

“Springfield, Illinois, May 12, 1860. My Dear Sir: Your brother, Dr. W. S. Wallace, shows me a letter of yours in which you request him to inquire if you may use a letter of mine to you in which something is said upon the Tariff question. I do not precisely remember what I did say in that letter, but I presume I said nothing substantially different from what I shall say now.

“In the days of Henry Clay, I was a Henry-Clay-Tariff man, and my views have undergone no material change upon that subject. I now think the Tariff question ought not to be agitated in the Chicago convention, but that all should be satisfied on that point with a presidential candidate whose antecedents give assurance that he would neither seek to force a Tariff law by executive influence, nor yet to arrest a reasonable one by a veto or otherwise. Just such a candidate I desire shall be put in nomination. I really have no objection to these views being publicly known, but I do wish to thrust no letter before the public now upon any subject. Save me from the appearance of obtrusion, and I do not care who sees this or my former letter. Yours very truly, A. Lincoln.”

(“Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln,” Vol. VI. Pages 11-12.)

Lincoln was evidently fearful that to press the Tariff question to the front as a party issue might alienate voters who were opposed to slavery, yet had not been convinced that a Protective Tariff was necessary to the prosperity of the country. The Tariff had not been discussed in a political campaign since 1844, and to undertake to educate the people on the subject would detract from the all-important work of eradicating the curse of slavery. But there was a strong current of sentiment for a change in the Tariff

taking possession of the minds of the people. This was shown in the October election in the State of Pennsylvania, when Andrew G. Curtin was elected Governor in a campaign largely fought on that question. When the delegates to the Republican convention met at Chicago, it developed that a strong sentiment prevailed among them in favor of placing the party before the country squarely on a Protective Tariff platform and a Tariff plank drawn by Henry C. Carey was adopted. Lincoln was made the candidate and victory followed.

When Lincoln passed through Pittsburgh on his journey to Washington for inauguration, he spoke briefly on the Tariff as follows:

Address at Pittsburgh, February 15, 1861.

“It is often said that the Tariff is the speciality of Pennsylvania. Assuming that direct taxation is not to be adopted, the Tariff question must be as durable as the government itself. It is a question of national housekeeping. It is to the government what replenishing the meal-tub is to the family. Ever-varying circumstances will require frequent modifications as to the amount needed and the sources of supply. So far there is little difference of opinion among the people. It is as to whether, and how far, duties on imports shall be adjusted to favor home production in the home market, that controversy begins. One party insists that such adjustment oppresses one class for the advantage of another; while the other party argues that, with all its incidents, in the long run all classes are benefited. In the Chicago platform there is a plank upon this subject which should be a general law to the incoming administration. We should do neither more nor less than we gave the people reason to believe we would when they gave us their votes. Permit me, fellow-citizens, to read the Tariff plank of the Chicago platform, or rather have it read in your hearing by one who has younger eyes.

“Mr. Lincoln’s private secretary then read Section 12 of the Chicago platform, as follows:

“That while providing revenue for the support of the General Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imposts as will encourage the development of the industrial interest of the whole country; and we commend that policy of national exchange which secures to working-men liberal wages, to agriculture remunerating prices, to mechanics and manufacturers adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence.”

“Mr. Lincoln resumed; As with all general propositions, doubtless there will be shades of difference in construing this. I have by no means a thoroughly matured judgment upon this subject, especially as to details; some general ideas

are about all. I have long thought it would be to our advantage to produce any necessary article at home which can be made of as good quality and with as little labor at home as abroad, at least by the difference of the carrying from abroad. In such case the carrying is demonstrably a dead loss of labor. For instance, labor being the true standard of value, is it not plain that if equal labor get a bar of railroad iron out of a mine in England, and another out of a mine in Pennsylvania, each can be laid down in a track at home cheaper than they could exchange countries, at least by the carriage? If there be a present cause why one can be both made and carried cheaper in money price than the other can be made without carrying, that cause is an unnatural and injurious one, and ought gradually, if not rapidly, to be removed. The condition of the Treasury at this time would seem to render an early revision of the Tariff indispensable. The Morrill (Tariff) bill, now pending before Congress, may or may not become a law. I am not posted as to its particular provisions, but if they are generally satisfactory, and the bill shall now pass, there will be an end for the present. If, however, it shall not pass, I suppose the whole subject will be one of the most pressing and important for the next Congress. By the Constitution, the Executive may recommend measures which he may think proper, and he may veto those he thinks improper, and it is supposed that he may add to these certain indirect influences to affect the action of Congress. My political education strongly inclines me against a very free use of any of these means by the Executive to control the legislation of the country. As a rule, I think it better that Congress should originate as well as perfect its measures without external bias. I therefore would rather recommend to every gentleman who knows he is to be a member of the next Congress to take an enlarged view, and post himself thoroughly, so as to contribute his part to such an adjustment of the Tariff as shall produce a sufficient revenue, and in its other bearings, so far as possible, be just and equal to all sections of the country and classes of the people" ("Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln," Vol. VI. Pages 126-129.)

Preferred Home Trade to Foreign Trade.

It should be noted that Lincoln at this time declared that it was the duty of the Republican party to carry out its Tariff plank, which he said "should be a general law to the incoming administration." After listening to the reading of the platform, he asserts a very important economic proposition. He said:

"For instance, labor being the true standard of value, is it not plain that if equal labor gets a bar of railroad iron out of a mine in England and another out of a mine in Pennsylvania, each can be laid down on a track at home cheaper

than they could exchange countries, at least by the carriage?"

From what follows it would appear that he here used the words "equal labor" in the sense of labor power as one would mention horse power. It is evident that it was in this sense that he used the term "equal labor," for in the next sentence he uses the term "money price," saying:

"If there be a present cause why one can be both made and carried cheaper in money price than the other can be made without carrying, that cause is an unnatural and injurious one and ought gradually if not rapidly to be removed."

The money price as here used must involve wages paid to labor. So his contention was that if a bar of iron can be taken out of a mine in England and on account of the lower wages paid to labor in that country, it can be both produced and shipped to the United States and sold for a lower price than a bar of iron can be taken out of an American mine by American labor, employed at the higher American standard of wages, that cause for the difference in price is an unnatural and injurious one and should be removed. The only way, of course, by which such injurious cause could be removed was either by reducing the wages of American labor to the European standard or by interposing Protective Tariff duties to shield American labor from such unequal and unjust conditions. It is important, then, that immediately before his inauguration he clearly and plainly asserted that when a foreign country could manufacture and then transport a finished article to our country and undersell our own industrial producers, a Protective Tariff became imperatively necessary in order to overcome that advantage of the foreigner. The value of these utterances in the Pittsburgh speech become greater when we consider the conditions under which the address was delivered. At this time nearly all of the Southern States had seceded from the Union, and on February 4, only eleven days before it was delivered, the Southern Confederacy was formed, its Congress had met at Montgomery, Alabama, and elected Jefferson Davis President. The speech, like all of the speeches which he delivered in his journey from Springfield to Washington, at this critical time, was conciliatory in its nature. He had studiously avoided the discussion of administrative policies on all economic and business questions, and confined himself to appeals to the patriotism of the people, urging on all occasions the preservation of the Union above everything else. His great endeavors was to win over to the support of the cause of the Union the people of the border States and the Douglas Democrats of the Free States. He had, all through his discussions of the slavery question, avoided arousing the antagonism arising out of business questions, and

was undoubtedly ready at this time to make concessions for the cause of peace on all questions excepting those affecting the integrity of the Union, and those sacred human rights which the Republican party was organized to preserve, and which he had so ably and earnestly upheld in those great debates and speeches which made him the leader and representative of the friends of humanity.

In his address to the Legislature of Pennsylvania, at Harrisburg, February 22, 1861, he referred to the Pittsburg speech as follows:

"Allusion has also been made by one of your honored speakers to some remarks recently made by myself at Pittsburg in regard to what is supposed to be the especial interest of this great commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I now wish only to say in regard to that matter, that the few remarks which I uttered on that occasion were rather carefully worded. I took pains that they should be so. I have seen no occasion since to add to them or subtract from them. I leave them precisely as they stand, adding only now that I am pleased to have an expression from you, gentlemen of Pennsylvania, signifying that they are satisfactory to you." ("Complete Works of Abraham Lincoln," Vol. VI. Pages 164-165.)

The Condition of the Country Under Fourteen Years of Free-Trade.

With the national treasury bankrupt; the industries paralyzed; the country drained of its gold; the war vessels in a state of decay or sent to foreign parts; the army disorganized and filled with traitors; the guns and cannon sent to rebel States; and the Free-Trade party in open revolt against the Union, Lincoln, on March 4, 1861, became President. Through four years of Civil War, "with malice towards no one and charity for all," he united the people of the North in the defense of the flag and for the preservation of the Union. He raised, armed and equipped an army of over two million of freemen, built a great navy and suppressed the most gigantic rebellion of modern times. He restored the credit of the nation; replenished the Treasury and raised over \$6,000,000,000 from his own people, not asking or borrowing a dollar from a foreign country. He restored the Protective system, imposing higher duties on imports than were ever known, and secured the home market to his own people. Every mill, forge, furnace; every farm and garden, was quickened into life as though touched by some magic power. Every able-bodied man was either at the front fighting for the flag or working night and day in some Protective occupation to sustain the armies in the field and make the nation rich and strong. The first question attended to was that of revenue, which was supplied by extending the duties on imports to non-com-

peting as well as competing articles by the acts of August 5, 1861, and December 24, 1861. By the act of July 1, 1862, a system of internal revenue taxes was established, which was enlarged and extended on March 3, 1863, May 7, 1864, June 30, 1864, and March 3, 1865. Every available source of revenue was resorted to. Licenses and taxes were imposed on every conceivable trade, occupation and profession. Taxes were levied on incomes and on all materials used in manufacturing and upon their products in all of the stages of production. These burdens placed on the industries of the country were so great that without compensatory duties on imports our manufacturers could not have withstood the competition of their foreign rivals. So high Protective Tariff duties were imposed on all competing products by the acts of July 14, 1862, March 3, 1863, April 29, 1864, June 30, 1864, and March 3, 1865, and the industries were enabled to grow and thrive and at the close of the struggle had been extended in variety and reached a magnitude not dreamed of by their most ardent friends.

President Lincoln and his able cabinet ministers were not unmindful of the lessons of history. Almost within the memory of men then living within seventy years, the world had witnessed Great Britain pass triumphantly through the Continental wars, break the power of Napoleon, the greatest military genius since Caesar; become the master of the carrying trade of the world, and rise to the first rank among the empires of modern times. Her military and naval forces and her exhaustless financial resources had been sustained through the cultivation of the industrial arts, fostered by Protective regulations. With the experience of mankind before them, the statesmen of the North at once turned to the Protective policy as the source of the nation's strength to carry it successfully through the destruction of property and exhaustion of resources which must result from the impending military conflict.

Stanton's Protective Order.

"Secretary Stanton," says Mr. Fowler (Fowler's Life of Edward M. Stanton, pp. 126, 127), "discovering that arms, clothing and supplies for the armies were largely purchased in Europe, said to Secretary Chase: 'If these things were purchased at home, the flow of gold abroad would be stopped and our factories lifted from depression.'"

Therefore, in the famous official "Order" of January 29, 1862, he declared:

"1. That no further contracts be made by this Department or any bureau thereof for any article of foreign manufacture that can be produced in the United States.

"2. All outstanding orders, agencies, authorities or licenses for the purchase

of arms, clothing or anything else in foreign countries, or of foreign manufacture, for the Department are revoked and annulled."

Great and far-sighted as this conception proved to be, Lincoln was "afraid it would exasperate our friends over the water," and Seward opposed it as likely to "complicate the foreign situation."

"It will have to be issued," replied Stanton, "or very soon there will be no situation to complicate."

"That closed the argument," says Mr. Fowler. "The order went forth and created the industrial era in America, against the ever-increasing pressure of which, throughout the world, the nations are still groaning their protests. It made of the United States a self-supporting and ten-fold more expansive, glorious and powerful nation than it was before. It was one of the most pregnant edicts ever issued by an American official, and it is one of the few adequate measures of Stanton's greatness."

The security and support given to domestic industries by the Tariff acts and the policy of the War Department so developed the resources and increased the wealth of the country that the loyal States soon became independent of foreign nations for everything necessary to a successful prosecution of the war. The wealth and industrial power thus created enabled the people to bear the enormous burdens of taxation incident to the war and to the discharge of the obligations incurred.

It has been contended by Free-Traders that the Protective Tariff laws signed by Lincoln were simply war measures intended when enacted to be abandoned at the close of the struggle, and that the Free-Trade policy of the Democratic party was to be restored. This may have been the views of many Congressmen who had little knowledge of the question, but this cannot reasonably be said of Lincoln when we consider his profound knowledge of the subject and his firm conviction that Protection was necessary to the prosperity of the country. The war had brought about an entirely new condition of affairs. The wages of labor had increased on an average of 67 per cent.; new mines had been opened; mills and furnaces had been built; a great system of manufacturing had been erected; demands for labor and labor products had greatly extended and a home market had been created which was the envy of the world. Lincoln would never have withdrawn Protection, left our industries to perish, and the wages of labor to be reduced to the standard of the old world by opening our market to be flooded with the products of the poorly paid labor of our foreign rivals.

It is inconceivable that Abraham Lincoln would have changed his opinions as to the wisdom and necessity for continuing the Protective system. His opin-

ions on the subject were well grounded, the result of a careful and thorough study of the question in all of its aspects. He was not only by conviction, but by sympathy and natural inclination, an extreme Protectionist. He had no sympathy with those international traders who buy cheap in one country to sell in another, regardless of the welfare of labor; nor with those foreign manufacturers who would keep the wages of their labor at a starvation point that they might undersell their competitors in foreign markets; nor with those short-sighted farmers who would impoverish the labor and industries of their own country by patronizing the pauper labor of Europe. His fine sensibilities had been shocked and he looked with horror upon the Southern planter who made his profits in raising cotton and tobacco by the labor of slaves driven to work under the lash of a cruel master. His great heart was overflowing with a sincere love for his fellowmen, and an unflinching devotion to the welfare of his country. His uttered words were expressions from his heart directed by a master intellect. He was neither influenced in forming his political opinions by the interest of a farmer seeking a market for his grains and provisions, nor by the desires of those manufacturers or traders whose supreme purpose was to gain profits. From a high eminence above the world of strife and selfish interests, Lincoln had looked forward to a time when the people of the United States would enter upon the full enjoyment of that happy state contemplated and striven for by our Revolutionary fathers, in which all men would stand equal before the law, and labor would be worthy of its hire. He saw in the future a nation of freemen occupying a land of plenty, with idleness and poverty, slavery and oppression abolished; with marts of trade, cities and industrial communities flourishing and thriving in every State of the Union; with the great resources of the nation developed and utilized; with mills, forges, furnaces, farms and gardens, through the industry of freemen, yielding the treasures of the earth to the comfort, independence and happiness of the people. This was the goal striven for by all sound and consistent Protectionists. Protection and prosperity; Protection and public welfare; Protection and good wages for labor, have been and are one and inseparable. If Abraham Lincoln had lived out the remaining years of his second term, he would have been the same Abraham Lincoln that he was from his humble beginning to the day of his tragic death. He never betrayed a great cause nor sacrificed a great principle. He would never have abandoned the cause of Protection to American labor and industries. He would have done previously what Grant and the great statesmen of the Republican party did upon making a thorough investigation of the subject and

readjusting the Tariff and internal revenue taxes for times of peace. During Grant's administration the Tariff was revised according to the plan recommended by Henry Clay in 1832. They repealed internal revenue taxes so far as they were burdens on industry, abolished direct taxes, and continued the system of duties on imports for the Protection of home industries, and by animating, diversifying and rewarding industry, made it possible for the American people to pay the national debt and to build up the most progressive, prosperous and greatest manufacturing and commercial nation in Christendom.

Lincoln's public career as a writer, speaker and Chief Executive places him in the foreground of the great constructive statesmen and Protectionists of the world. Washington introduced the system of Protection, and Lincoln perfected

it; Washington signed the first Protective Tariff law, and Lincoln signed the highest Protective Tariff law ever passed by Congress. The Protective policy introduced by Washington was supported by Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, John Quincy Adams and Andrew Jackson. It stood for forty-five years until overthrown by the friends of slavery and the enemies of the Union, but was restored and perfected by Lincoln and continued by Grant, Hayes, Harrison and McKinley. It was overthrown for three years by Cleveland with great disaster to the country. It is now being assailed by Woodrow Wilson, but the spirit of Washington and Lincoln still lives and the end is not yet.

"You can fool a part of the people a part of the time, and some of the people all of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

Every sincere Protectionist should regularly read **THE AMERICAN ECONOMIST**, \$2.00 a year. Address 339 Broadway, New York.

Ten copies of this document, No.1, sent for 30 cents. Address The Tariff League, 339 Broadway, New York.

TARIFF OUT OF POLITICS?

To Editors: The New York Evening Sun started it. Below are numerous variations of the thought that the Tariff cannot be taken out of politics. Please amplify with one line of your own. Keep it going. Also, kindly forward copy of paper containing your addition. Editor AMERICAN ECONOMIST.

"Take the Tariff out of politics"—
"take the sentiment out of love."—New York Evening Sun.

"Take the letters out of the alphabet."—New York Press.

"And the mirth out of laughter."—Philadelphia Inquirer.

"Take the oxygen out of air."—Erie (Pa.) Dispatch.

"Take business out of business by Free-Trade."—Lyons (N. Y.) Republican.

"Better say the present Tariff put notes on much property."—Tazewell (Va.) Republican.

Take the Satan out of Hades,

Take the headache out of booze,

Take the motion out of movies,

Take the sleepiness from snooze.

—Lackawanna (N. Y.) Journal.

"Oh, well; take the politics out of politics."—New York Evening Sun.

"Take the Prince of Denmark out of Hamlet."—San Francisco Chronicle.

"Take the poetry out of verse."—New York Evening Sun.

The American Protective Tariff League desires us to add a line to "Take the Tariff out of politics." Anything to oblige: "Take the P. O. out of pork."—Cleveland Leader.

"Take the people out of politics; take liberty out of government."—Monmouth (Ill.) Atlas, January 31.

"Take the heat out of fire."—Secaucus (N. J.) News, January 29.

"Take daylight out of darkness."—Omro (Wis.) Herald, January 29.

"Take the flowers out of speech."—New York Evening Sun, February 3.

"Take the cloves out of prohibition."—Idaho Statesman.

"Take the chat out of a movie audience."—Coeur d'Alene (Idaho) Press.

"Take the lips out of kisses."—Dover (Del.) Sentinel.

Take the full-house out of poker,

Take the frenzy from the mob,

Take the stroke from Willie Hoppe,

Take the bingle from Ty Cobb,

—Scottdale (Pa.) Independent.

"Take the Tariff out of politics?" Why, sure! by all means—if you're the chap to do it—and at the same time take the heartaches out of booze.—Augusta (Me.) Journal.

"Take the air out of rubber tires, take the gas away from glass making; it will shrink, it will wither, it may fail even to survive, for 'the devil take the hindmost' is a motto we must hear; we'll live it, too, by ginger, when the Free-Traders arrive."—Jeanette (Pa.) News.

"Politics and the Tariff have been, are and will be as inseparable as sunshine and the sun—take the sun out of sunshine!"—Salisbury (Md.) Tribune, February 11.

"Take the laughter out of childhood."—Payette (Idaho) Independent, February 10.

"Take the 'kick' out of whiskey."—Roundup (Mont.) Record, February 4.

"Take the Tariff out of politics! As well try to take the 'pep' out of pepper."—Brewster (Wash.) Herald.

If you want to fix the West,

Take the salmon out the can;

Pinchotize the timber,

Take away from girls the tan.

—Chinook (Wash.) Observer.

"Take the flop out of Woodrow."—Bay Shore (L. I.) Journal.

"Take the Tariff out of politics," shout the Democratic statesmen as a faint hope. Yes, take the color out of the rainbow. When the Democrats admit that we are right and they are wrong, let us enact a Protective Tariff, and quit tampering with it. The Tariff will be out of politics, but not until then.—Batavia (O.) Courier.

"Take Free-Trade from Democracy—if you can."—A Harmon (Ill.) correspondent.

"Take Hiram from the Johnsonites,

Take Teddy from the Progs,

Take the Tariff out of politics,

And the world will slip its cogs."

—Sanger (Cal.) News.

"Take the devil out of all of us and there will be less room for pain."—Carmi (Ill.) Convincer, February.

"Take the Tariff out of politics?"—with ease! Take the wind out of tornado and the water out of seas; take the light out of sunshine and the cold out of freeze.

"Take the Tariff out of politics?" for sure! Take safe out of safety and healing out of cure; take stable out of stability—no nation will endure.—Chester-ton (Md.) Enterprise.

"Take the value out of money,

Take the sting out of bees,

Take the sweetness out of honey,

Take the timber out of trees."

—Newport (N. H.) Champion.

"The talk of taking the Tariff out of politics is the same as asking for taxation without representation."—World's Work.

"While there is a great endeavor to take the Tariff out of politics why does not some statesman take politics out of the Tariff?"—Bay City (Mich.) National Farmer.

"Take the Tariff out of politics? Take the hugs and kisses out of spooning."—Marion (Ill.) anonymous correspondent.

"Take the substance out of flour and the sweetness out of sugar."—Trenton (Mich.) Times.

"Take the Stars from the field of Old Glory."—Huntingburg (Ind.) Independent.

"Take the value out of money,

Take the pleasure out of fun,

Take the sweetness out of honey;

Take—Oh, what's the use? It can't be done."

—Plymouth (Mass.) News, March 24.

"Take the 1 out of 100."—Milwaukee Sentinel.

Take the lesson from the learner,
Take the writing from the clerk;
Take the earnings from the earner,
And the worker from his work.
—Gladstone (Mich.) Delta.

"Take the Tariff out of politics." Why not take "e" out of alphabet, or laughter out of childhood?—Ashtabula (O.) Star.

"Take the Tariff out of politics,"
Take the moisture out of rain,
Take the colors from the rainbow,
Take the kernel out of grain.
—Brookfield (Mo.) Gazette.

"Take the Tariff out of politics? Not till we have absolute Free-Trade."—Union (N. Y.) Union-Endicott News.

"Take the raindrops out of showers; take the fragrance out of flowers."—Ord. (Nebr.) Quiz.

"Or take the 'Bull' out of 'Bull Moose.'"—Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald.

"Take the stars and stripes out of our flag. Take hope out of life."—AMERICAN ECONOMIST reader.

"'Take the Tariff out of politics,' says the New York Sun. Take the angel out of heaven; take the cooing from the dove; take the warble from the birdlet; take religion out of love."—Elkton (Mich.) Review.

"They can't take the Tariff out of politics, but they can take it out of the hands of the Free-Trade Tariff tinkers."—Kansas City (Mo.) Liberal News.

"Take the Tariff out of politics? It is a cry born of forlorn hope. It is as feasible as to try to take the lye out of soft soap."—Tahlequah (Okla.) Sun.

"The differences of opinion and conviction which put the Tariff question into politics are not differences as to facts, but as to the interpretation of facts. Hence the fallacy of 'taking the Tariff question out of politics' by creating a mere statistical board, bureau or commission."—Muncie (Ind.) National Republican.

Take the Tariff out of politics,
Take the motor from the car;
Take the talk out of Teddy;
Take the battle out of war.—Hancock (Mich.) Copper Journal.

"Take disaster from our labor and industries without the re-establishment of a High Protective Tariff."—Breaux Bridge (La.) Advance.

"Take the Tariff out of politics!" Take the gas out o' gasoline and the "old boat" will stop; take the electricity out o' the arc and darkness will prevail.—Caldwell (O.) Leader.

Trying to take the Tariff out of politics is causing President Wilson a good deal of anxiety, and he is sidestepping like a barefooted boy in a brier patch.—Bethany (Mo.) Republican.

"Take the Tariff out of politics? Might as well take the honey out of the honey-moon."—Rhineland (Wis.) News.

"Take the limberness from limber,
Take the spiciness from spice,
Take the wood from out the timber,
Take the water out of ice.
(Next?)—Astria (Ore.) Morning Astorian.

"Take the Tariff out of politics?"
Take the moisture out of snow.
Take the 'our' out of flour,
And the 'leven' out of dough."
—Fedora (S. D.) Messenger.

"Take the Tariff out of politics! You might as well try to take the bung out of bungle."—Decorah (Ia.) Republican.

"As well try taking selfishness
From out the heart of man;
For the Demys, in their foolishness,
Will make trade free if they can."
—Columbus (O.) Saturday Monitor.

"If the Tariff were taken out of politics what would Presidential candidates do for an issue?"—Mobile (Ala.) Tribune.

"The Tariff can be taken out of politics as easily as the 'squal' can be taken from the pig and the 'squal' from the tomcat."—A North Carolina correspondent.

"Removing the Tariff out of politics would be about as easy as taking the hole out of the doughnut."—Muncie (Ind.) National Republican.

Take the Tariff out of politics.
Take the sweet out of sugar.
Take the jingle out of money.
Take—well, miracles do not happen any more.—Huntsville (Ark.) Republican.

What is the use of talking about "retiring the Tariff from politics." It cannot be done.—Marion (Ia.) Register.

Taking Tariff out of politics is like taking salt out of soup.—Waterloo (Ill.) Republican.

To take Tariff out of Politics
And let Free-Trade prevail
Is just a Democratic trick
That takes food from the dinner pail.
—Craig (Colo.) Courier.

"Take the Tariff out of politics," shout the Democratic statesmen as a faint hope. Yes, take the color out of the rainbow. When the Democrats admit that we are right and they are wrong, let us enact a Protective Tariff and quit tampering with it. The Tariff will be out of politics, but not until then.—La Plata (Mo.) Republican.

Removing the Tariff from politics is like solving the fourth dimension—especially when it comes to wool.—American Sheep Breeder and Wool Grower.

Taking the Tariff out of politics always reminds us of the hospital report of the medical interne who wrote his chief: "The operation proved preeminently successful, but the patient died."—AMERICAN ECONOMIST Contributor.

"Take the notes out of music."—AMERICAN ECONOMIST.

The Industrial Development of Nations

and

A History of the Tariff Policies of the United States, and of Great Britain,
Germany, France, Russia and Other European Countries

BY

Hon. GEORGE B. CURTISS

OF BINGHAMTON, NEW YORK

THE WORK OF A LIFETIME

THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONS is the result of more than thirty years' research and study. It is the work of a lifetime and has involved in its production the largest financial expenditure of any single treatise on the subject ever published.

THE AUTHOR

The qualifications of Mr. Curtiss for this important undertaking need not be rehearsed for those who are familiar with his distinguished career as a lawyer and the pre-eminent position he holds at the bar. In 1900, President McKinley appointed him United States Attorney for the Northern District of New York, a position he has filled with marked distinction for more than twelve years.

The Binghamton Press.

PRICE

Bound in Fancy Basket Buckram (gilt top, gold back, with silk ribbon, bookmark) \$15.00

In Three Volumes of 1936 pages. Size 7x10 inches. Illustrated with 33 full-page portraits. The pages have subject headings, marginal notes, and are printed in admirably clear type. The binding is all that is to be desired. All of the little details of good book-making have been observed.

T. W. COMPTON

Sales Manager

160 Fifth Avenue

New York

Orders received by

THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE

339 Broadway

New York